

67:4

The CHURCHMAN

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

VOL. LXVII.

SEVENTY-FOURTH YEAR

NO. 4

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN AUSTRALIA
Original Sin and Justification by Faith
The Secular Reaction and Its Legacy
The Bible and the Pulpit
A Christian Interpretation of Disease
John Evelyn

For complete list of contents see within

DECEMBER 1953

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS LTD

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4

1/6 per copy

6/- per annum, post free

THE
Church of England
ALMANACK
 FOR
1954

containing the Prayer Book
 Lectionary and also the Re-
 vised Lectionary (of 1922),
 important anniversary dates,
 and much other interesting
 material.

Ready early November —

Price **6d.** per copy (**7½d.**
 including postage); **6s.** per
 dozen (post free); **45s.** per
 hundred (post free).

ORDER NOW
Every Church member
should possess one

All books advertized or re-
 viewed in the *Church Gazette*,
 and also Prayer Books,
 Hymn Books, and other
 Christian Literature,
 may be ordered
 from the

CHURCH BOOK
ROOM PRESS
LTD.

7, Wine Office Court,
Fleet Street, London,
E.C.4

Church
Pastoral-Aid
Society
ORDINATION
FUND

There are now over 70 men receiving
 grants from the

C.P.A.S.
ORDINATION FUND

during their training at College.
 Many other Evangelical Ordination
 Candidates are also in need of
 financial help, but to enable us to
 give this

MORE FUNDS
ARE REQUIRED.

We rely on evangelical churchmen
 to help us in this vitally important
 work. Please send us your gifts and
 remember this work in your prayers.

The C.P.A.S. is seeking to stress the
 challenge for service in the full time
 ministry of the Church of England
 and the Society's Candidates' Secre-
 tary, the Rev. E. G. H. Saunders,
 M.A., will welcome opportunities to
 speak to young people in Universities,
 Schools and Parishes.

All gifts for the

C.P.A.S.
ORDINATION FUND

and enquiries for further informa-
 tion should be sent to:

The Clerical Assistant
Secretary,

CHURCH
PASTORAL
AID
SOCIETY,
7 Victoria St.,
London,
S.W.1.



(Telephone: ABBey 5091/6340)

THE CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER-
DECEMBER 1953

Contents

Vol. LXVII. No. 4
New Series

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	195
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN AUSTRALIA	
The Rev. L. L. Nash, M.A., B.D.	196
ORIGINAL SIN AND JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH	
The Rev. D. B. Knox, B.A., M.Th.	202
THE SECULAR REACTION AND ITS LEGACY	
" Historicus. "	208
THE BIBLE AND THE PULPIT	
The Rev. A. M. Stibbs, M.A.	213
A CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION OF DISEASE	
The Rev. Professor R. K. Harrison, Ph.D.	220
JOHN EVELYN : A STUDY IN ROYALIST PIETY	
The Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., D.D., F.R.Hist.S.	228
BOOK REVIEWS	
Emil Brunner, <i>The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption</i>	235
Martin Dibelius, <i>Paul</i>	236
Edward Carpenter, <i>That Man Paul</i>	238
A. R. George, <i>Communion with God in the New Testament</i>	239
Ulrich E. Simon, <i>A Theology of Salvation</i>	240
Ivor Bulmer-Thomas, <i>The Party System in Great Britain</i>	242
Alan Richardson, <i>Genesis I-XI</i>	243
T. R. Milford, <i>Foolishness to the Greeks</i>	245
Frank Houghton, <i>Amy Carmichael of Dohnavur</i>	245
Roland Koh, <i>The Writings of St. Luke</i>	246
Geoffrey Murray, <i>Matters of Life and Death</i>	247
John Drewett, <i>Signs of the Times</i>	247
NOTES ON BOOKS RECEIVED	248

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor :

THE REV. J. C. POLLOCK, M.A.

The Editor welcomes manuscripts, which should be about 3,000 words in length. He cannot guarantee their return unless stamps are enclosed. Short notes on Theological subjects are also welcomed.

Books for review, manuscripts and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor, at

Horsington Rectory, Templecombe, Somerset.

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers.

Price : One Shilling and Sixpence

Annual Subscription : Six Shillings per annum, post free

In the U.S.A., annual subscription one dollar, payable to
The Seminary Bookstore, Virginia Theological Seminary,
Alexandria, Va., U.S.A.

Publishers :

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4.

Writers in this Issue

THE REV. L. L. NASH is Vicar of St. Augustine's, Moreland, Melbourne, and part-time lecturer at Ridley College.

THE REV. D. B. KNOX is Tutor of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

THE REV. PROFESSOR R. K. HARRISON is Head of the Department of Hebrew, University of Western Ontario, and Professor of Old Testament at Huron College.

THE REV. A. M. STIBBS is Vice-Principal of Oakhill College, Southgate.

THE REV. C. S. CARTER was formerly Principal of Clifton Theological College.

Editorial

THE phrase 'the day of opportunity' has been so often heard, year by year, that the thought it expresses may seem trite. Yet the Church of England, and evangelicalism in particular, has an opportunity to-day which is to be envied. There is little doubt in the minds of thoughtful men that the Christianity which once seemed out-dated, except to its initiates, now holds the key to the future. The problem, however, is that the majority of our countrymen are vague as to the meaning of the Faith, puzzled as to its exact relevance to their lives, and still confused by the backwash of controversies now dead.

The Church must therefore put forth a message which is clearcut and unmistakable. The trumpet must not give an uncertain sound. Teaching and preaching must be plain and precise, yet not shallow. The aim of witness and evangelism must be certain, yet not limited. And the lives of the exponents of the gospel must be as positive as the truth they profess.

For this, hard theological thinking is needed. This journal will seek to play its part in guiding that thought. THE CHURCHMAN's terms of reference are wide. 'Theology' will be taken in its largest sense, covering not only the study of doctrine, ethics and liturgy but their relation to the practical problems of the day. For if THE CHURCHMAN is to continue its usefulness and, in the late editor's words, 'to make a yet more effective contribution to the theological thought of the Church of England', it is essential that it should be related firmly both to the eternal gospel and to the contemporary scene.

It is natural that the bulk of the journal's matter should be theological in the stricter sense of the term. One article in each issue, however, will be topical, and another will deal with some practical aspect of the Christian ministry. There will also be articles on matters of general and historical interest. It will be noticed also that one of the contributors in this issue writes anonymously. Not many years back almost all the articles in quarterlies were anonymous, in order that the reader should not be deflected in his study by prejudices regarding their authors. Such practice may not be fully advisable to-day, but anonymous articles will, as deliberate policy, appear from time to time.

A new editor must always be conscious of his inadequacy. But he can take encouragement from the fact that a Christian journal must be a partnership, between editor, writers and readers. It is important that readers should be ready to submit their findings on the subjects which interest them and to allow others to share their thinking. In this way THE CHURCHMAN will never lack worthwhile material. But more necessary than that is the partnership of prayer. Without prayer, as is obvious, these pages will be barren. The Editor asks therefore that every reader will endeavour to join him in regular prayer for God's continued blessing on THE CHURCHMAN, that, in the words of the Ordinal, 'Thy holy Name may be for ever glorified, and Thy blessed kingdom enlarged'.

The Church of England in Australia

BY THE REV. L. L. NASH, M.A., B.D.

THE Church of England in Australia is too frequently assessed, both from within its own ranks and by the outsider, on a population basis. In every State throughout the Commonwealth according to the census returns, the distribution per cent of population according to religion gives the Church of England 39%, the highest being in Tasmania with 48%, and the lowest in South Australia, 29%. The next denomination claims 20%, Roman Catholicism. But these government figures are no indication of the strength, cohesion and influence of the respective Churches. It is freely accepted that the dominant religious body is the Roman Catholic Church, in politics, property and social service.

The Church of England came to Australia as a State religion with the first convict contingent in 1788. The first chaplains, Richard Johnson and his successor, Samuel Marsden, had chequered relations with the administration which, on the whole, was somewhat unfavourably disposed to true religion and virtue, but in 1813-36 important changes came. First, the Bishopric of Calcutta was founded in 1814, and ten years later the Archdeaconry of New South Wales was constituted, subject and subordinate to the jurisdiction, spiritual and ecclesiastical, of the Bishop of Calcutta. Archbishop Lowther Clarke says there is no record of any episcopal function having been performed by the Bishop of Calcutta in Australia. The second Archdeacon was W. G. Broughton, appointed in 1829 by the Duke of Wellington. In that year there were eight Churches and twelve clergymen in Australia, the latter being largely chaplains of penal establishments. The arrival of free settlers in increasing numbers developed the good lands in the south-east of the continent. Many of them were sincerely religious and with the development of the nation came the progress of the Church. Archdeacon Broughton, an active, energetic man, visited England, and his story as given there of the spiritual destitution of Australia, led to the formation by Letters Patent of the Bishopric of Australia in 1836. At this time there were seventeen Churches in the whole of the Continent. The Bishopric of Tasmania was created in 1842, but great changes came in 1847, when the Diocese of Australia was divided into Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Newcastle. The development continued throughout the boom times of the latter half of the century when gold and wool brought so much prosperity, so that with the creation of St. Arnaud in 1926 the total number of Bishoprics reached twenty-five, and there they have stayed.

At an important meeting in 1850, the six bishops, amongst other matters, affirmed the necessity of Provincial and Diocesan Synods, and they recommended the inclusion of the laity in such Synods to consult and decide with the clergy all questions affecting the temporalities of the Church. This was a momentous decision, in agreement with the

spirit of the times in these young colonies which had just received permission from Westminster to form representative governments. Mr. Gladstone was heart and soul in the movement and had advised all colonial churches to "organize themselves on the basis of voluntary consensual compact, which was the basis on which the Church of Christ rested from the first". After much consultation with the wisest and best of Church leaders in England, the Archbishop of Canterbury himself introduced a Bill permitting members of the Church of England in the dominions beyond the seas to manage, under certain restrictions, their own ecclesiastical affairs. When this Bill was rejected by the Commons, Bishop Perry of Melbourne acted on his own initiative and obtained from the Victorian Parliament the Church Act, 1854. Other States followed in due course, after some hesitation, and these Church Acts remain in substance the same to this day.

The twentieth century has witnessed the attempt to unify the constitution of the Church in Australia along the lines of political federation achieved in 1901. But not much success has been achieved for various reasons. Australia is a vast country sparsely inhabited, except for population concentrations around the capital cities which themselves are hundreds of miles apart. Until the very recent years of air travel, each population unit developed very much along its own lines, and to-day, the difference in mind and outlook is far greater between Melbourne and Sydney than between London and York; even more than between London and Edinburgh. This obtains practically everywhere even amongst the smaller units. There is a large body of opinion in Western Australia and Tasmania convinced that political federation has actually been deleterious to the economic development of those states. With the passage of the years, certain dioceses have become practically "monochrome" in ecclesiastical outlook. And this heightens tension rather than eases it. A hundred years ago when the first steps of ecclesiastical self-government were made, Australia led the way in the movement of associating the laity with the clergy in the direct government of the Church, but succeeding generations have not been able to reach unanimity on the next steps to be taken concerning the limiting safeguards then imposed. All provincial constitutions are tied to the doctrine and practice of the Church of England at the time when their Church Acts were passed, and the chequered career of Prayer Book Revision in England represents the dilemma of the Church in Australia. It is generally recognized that the 1662 Prayer Book needs adaptation and expanding for Australian conditions, but a large body of Church opinion is rightly wary of the impulsive hot-heads of the Oxford Movement. There is even a great body of Church people who consider, like all who set up homeland traditions in a new country, that the Church of the mother country came alarmingly near to forsaking the right old ways in 1928. Nevil Shute, the English novelist now settled in Australia, has sensed this trend and foresees that England will move further to the Left while the Dominions will verge to the Right.

This strong divergence of opinion as to the nature and authority of the Church is seen in the failure of General Synod for more than twenty years to come to any agreement on a constitution for the whole Church of England in Australia as one unit of the Anglican Communion.

Each suggested draft of a constitution has been finally bogged down upon the question of the Appellate Tribunal. How shall the final Court of Appeal in the Church for faith and morals be constituted? Have the laity an inherent right to be associated with those who define the faith of the Church? Or is it only the clergy as the experts, and endued with special authority because of the grace of orders?

An influential section, wearied by the hampering limitations of decisions by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and maintaining that the Church is constituted by Spirit and not Common or Statutory Law of a semi-Anglican legislature, is naturally impatient lest the "Privy Council" attitude to the Church keep us as immobile in Australia as in England. About as equal a weight of opinion would develop Bishop Perry's thesis into the whole of Church life and maintain that, even though Synods in the early Church were apparently clerical only, the universal education of the twentieth century leads the Holy Spirit in the Church to pronounce that it is quite possible, and even desirable, for laymen to be associated with clerics in the highest Church courts, even in the trial of a clerk allegedly delinquent in faith and morals.

The Archbishop of Canterbury is said to have urged in his addresses before leading Church people during his 1951 tour in Australia, not to give up hoping that a satisfactory solution can be achieved in what has proved to be the impasse of a quarter of a century.

Church building in Australia has throughout the period been mainly utilitarian. Some of the older Churches, especially in New South Wales and Tasmania, have claims to architectural value, but just as our houses are quickly put up, and because of the movements of population after industry during these last forty years, as quickly superseded, so there is not the beauty in Church buildings there is in England. All the capital cities have impressive Cathedral Churches, Sydney's an architectural gem far too small, and Brisbane's unfinished. But the buildings erected in the present generation have been mostly in the red-brick tradition with pseudo-Gothic windows, quite an undistinguished feature in the landscape of both town and country.

The Australian Church has not produced any great weight of scholarship. Training for the ministry has improved in quality over the past twenty years. Moore College, Sydney, was founded in 1856, and each diocese and state has had to do its best to supplement the trickle of English trained clergy. The Lucas-Tooth scholarship has for a generation given Australian-trained postulants for the ministry an opportunity of three years at Oxford, and has been well used. The main method of training until very recent years was mostly along the lines of apprenticeship. Young men went out to the country districts where they read the services and received instruction from the Bishop of the Diocese and one or two of his clergy. It was common for a Bishop travelling to England to have in mind as the first urgent purpose of his visit to appeal to young men in the Home Church to come out to Australia and work their way into the ministry. Many who responded to this challenge have done good work. In spite of the strenuous attempts of Bishop Moorhouse of Melbourne (1876-86) to link up the best of his ordinands to the emerging University of Melbourne, to take

a degree was the exception rather than the rule. General Synod tried to provide a standard for non-matriculating students for the ministry by the establishment in 1891 of the Australian College of Theology which confers certificates in lieu of degrees (licentiate, scholar and fellow in Theology) thus avoiding the university nomenclature. Much sore feeling was recently caused by the change of the fellowship to a doctorate; but this has not been accepted everywhere because the resolutions of General Synod are operative only when the individual diocese formally accepts them. The past ten years, however, have witnessed not only the increasing efficiency of the Theological Colleges, e.g., Ridley, Melbourne, founded in 1910 for the training of an evangelical clergy and named after the Cambridge institution; but an increasing desire on the part of candidates for Holy Orders to read for a University degree, and quite a number of graduates have proceeded to England and gained higher degrees. In 1950 the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham founded a daughter house on the outskirts of Adelaide where postulants are tested and come under the training and discipline of such well known persons as Father A. G. Hebert. They are required to do the minimum of earning their living at "readerships" during the course of training which extends no less than five years. This is a challenge to those training institutions which maintain Reformation principles and practices; and it is being eagerly followed. The future is bright for the intellectual standing of Australian clergymen. It can be said that the average clergyman in Australia had to work harder than his brother in England until very recent years, and the peripatetic life combined with an inadequate intellectual training gave little opportunity to engage in necessary reading. There is an Australian Church Quarterly published, mainly Tractarian in character. Many clergy both contribute to and write for the *Reformed Theological Review* produced locally with Presbyterians and Methodists.

The Bush Brotherhood movement, supported enthusiastically from its inauguration by Bishop Winnington-Ingram, did much in the early years of this century to bring the ministrations of the church into the out-back areas, especially in Queensland, and in the present generation it practically dominates the episcopate by weight of numbers. In the early twenties, the evangelical leader, S. J. Kirkby, later Bishop, founded the Bush Church Aid Society which is still doing excellent work in finding and training men for the ministry who serve the sparsely populated areas.

Australia has not produced many poets, and it must be admitted that in hymn writing and hymnody, the Australian supplement to the Book of Common Praise (1947) reveals lack of talent; Bishop Pilcher, Bishop Gilbert White and Dean Aickin are not Australian-born, though Sir Robert Garran and Kenneth Henderson are. In 1903, however, Sydney Synod initiated the Australian Psalter, which proved to be merely the old Cathedral Psalter supplemented by extra tunes for the Canticles.

Two Church papers are issued, the *Australian Church Record* of conservative outlook, with a limited issue; and the recently reconstructed and re-named *Anglican* which is meeting a need in Australian Church journalism to off-set in some way the remarkably efficient

Roman Catholic journals published for their own adherents. In the field of broadcasting nothing has yet been achieved on the scale of the Roman Catholic 2SM operating from Sydney, but 2CH from the same city is controlled by a Committee of the non-Roman Churches for Sunday programmes. Anglicans, however, make a very effective contribution in the presentation of religious broadcasting from the Government stations which is distributed roughly on a population basis. The choirs of the various main cathedrals are heard over the air regularly, particularly St. Paul's, Melbourne, until the retirement of Dr. A. E. Floyd who for many years was the chief figure in church music throughout the Commonwealth.

In co-operative movements in the religious life of the country, the leaders of the Church of England are well to the fore. The Bible Society President in nearly every State is an Anglican leader, generally the Metropolitan. The World Council of Churches has an Australian section well supported and led by the Primate, the Archbishop of Sydney (Dr. Mowll); and the Archbishop of Melbourne (Dr. Booth) has accepted an invitation to attend the next World Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1954 in America.

In spite of the pressures of a rapidly expanding life and economy, and the need for constant building, the Australian Church has always been diligent in the evangelization of the nations. The second Chaplain to New South Wales, Samuel Marsden, constantly advocated the cause of the despised Aborigines before the authorities who found themselves in a terrible dilemma because white and black could mix no better than oil and water. Marsden also initiated the evangelization of the Maoris in New Zealand, himself making the journey several times to those islands to supervise and promote the work. In 1825 a committee of public minded and humanitarian citizens was formed for the amelioration of the hard lot of the Australian Aborigines, but the position progressively deteriorated until the whole race was practically driven from the good lands of the south-east to desolate country in the north and north-west. However, the tide has now turned. The Australian Board of Missions, brought into existence by the momentous 1850 meeting of the six Bishops, and the Church Missionary Society, finally constituted on a Commonwealth basis in 1916, have concentrated upon educating public opinion on behalf of the scattered remnant of the Aboriginal people, about 60,000 in 1920, so that Government now considers the welfare of the Aboriginal a social responsibility, and Mussolini's jibe now no longer holds true, "If you want to see what happens to native minorities under British rule, go and study the Australian Aborigine". But not only within the Commonwealth, but elsewhere, the Australian Church has shown a missionary responsibility. The evangelization of New Guinea received an impetus with the arrival of the first Bishop (Stone-Wigg) in 1898, and to-day the flourishing Church life in that diocese is a living witness to the power of Christ to save. The Church Missionary Society of Australia and Tasmania has ninety missionaries stationed throughout the world, mostly in the framework of the English C.M.S. network, except in the diocese of Central Tanganyika (East Africa) which, since its establishment in 1928, has been led by three Australians as Bishop and a team of

Australian missionaries. This year, the Primate (Dr. Mowll) after a tour on his return from the Travancore Conference, called upon the Church to consider the need for Australia, as the only wholly white nation in the Pacific, to consider its Christian good-neighbourliness with South East Asia, particularly because of fast closing doors in that area. This challenge has been enthusiastically received by all sections of the Church. One of the abiding results of the Second World War was to jolt the average Australian out of their complacency of isolationism into which he had fallen during this century when only Europe mattered in world affairs, and this awareness is reflected in the increasing missionary contributions which have been received over the past ten years, although the pound value has by no means maintained itself.

In the pioneering days of the last century, it was remarkable how many leading citizens could be numbered in the councils of the Church throughout the Commonwealth. They themselves would acquire sites for new churches and initiate the formation and financing of new bishoprics. The Synods would often be doughty battlegrounds where sides were taken vigorously and the layman's voice heard as frequently as the parson's, whether in matters of Church doctrine or finance. Judges, professional men and leading business men gave of their time, wisdom and resources in the service of the Church. There are not so many of them to-day and they are not so vocal where the faith of the Church is concerned. But it is to the credit of the Church of England in Australia that it associated the laity on an equal footing with the clergy in the direct management of all Church affairs two generations before June, 1920, when the Church Assembly (England) met for the first time, and this pioneering venture now stands the Church in good stead.

It is sometimes suggested that to call ourselves the Church of England is an anachronism and that perhaps Anglican or Episcopal would be more fitting, but the proposed alteration has not been well received because there seems to be no general desire amongst Church members to jettison the well-known and time-honoured description of the Church of our fathers which we affectionately, though perhaps illegally, call the Church of England in Australia, and which we know to be truly Catholic and Apostolic.

God, Who didst lead our fathers here,
And gave to them this spacious land,
We thank Thee for our heritage
Of bush and plain and golden sand.

Ours be the joy to take our stand
With banner of the Cross unfurl'd,
God's watchers o'er the ocean isles,
God's witness to the Eastern world.

DEAN AICKIN (Ob. 1937).

The author wishes to acknowledge his debt to Archbishop Lowther Clarke's "Constitutional Church Government".

Original Sin and Justification by Faith

BY THE REV. D. B. KNOX, B.A., M.Th.

*The substance of a lecture at the Oxford Conference of
Evangelical Churchmen*

THOMAS BECON, Archbishop Cranmer's chaplain, wrote an allegory about a private dinner party through which he expounded the way of salvation. The first of the four courses which the cook served up consisted of texts from scripture which set out the sinfulness of man's condition "This is a bitter dish to begin the meal," a guest complained. "Its bitterness is necessary to be digested," his host replied, "that you might the better appreciate the delicacy of the dishes that follow. A knowledge of ourselves is necessary to understand God's grace".

Scripture teaches clearly that all humanity is sinful. No child of Adam avoids sin.¹ This testimony of scripture is clear; but we should not need the light of scripture to arrive at this elementary truth about human nature, at least in this generation when the marks of human sinfulness are so clearly to be discerned all around us. The question arises, why is sinfulness universal? Pelagius had an answer, viz, the bad example of society into which children are born. There are modern sociologists who give the same reply. Change the environment, isolate the child from the entail of the past, and the sinful propensities will not develop. But experience shows that this is not so. Sinfulness is innate, an integral part of human nature as it now is.

The Bible does not speak much of the origin of sinfulness in the individual. Romans 5. 12 is the crux. In this verse we are in difficulty exegetically because St. Paul has not completed his sentence. But it is plain that he is contrasting Adam and Christ. The point of the comparison is that the actions of both affect a wider area than their individual lives. Christ's single act of obedience has brought life to multitudes. St. Paul's point would be lost if he did not believe that Adam's act of disobedience had brought death to all; death passed upon all, for that all sinned, presumably in Adam.

Different explanations of how Adam's sin involve his posterity have been given. Origen arguing in parallel to Hebrews 7. 10, said all of us sinned in Adam, in the same way as Levi paid tithes to Melchisedek. A later view, popular in reformed circles, was that, Adam being the federal head of the human race, God imputed his sin to his descendants. It is worth remembering that neither Archbishop Cranmer nor John Calvin held this view.

Another view, which has affinities to Augustine, is that just as all men share Adam's physical life, by an unbroken physical connection, so we share his character and soul by an unbroken succession of descent.

This is true. However we think of the origin of the human race,

¹ Romans, iii. 23; iii. 10-18; I John i. 10.

about which so little is known scientifically, we all have an unbroken physical connection with the first humans, and have had passed on to us what is called human nature. And that nature, not only by the testimony to scripture, but also from easy observation, universally has a deep rooted proneness to sin. The origin of this is not so important as the fact.

Hitherto in this article we have assumed that we know what sin is, without defining its meaning. Shall we define it as that which is contrary to the mind of God? Thus a state of affairs can be sin, as much as the active trespass or offence. Or perhaps we might define the word eschatologically, to keep within the fashion of modern theology! Sin, then, is that which must receive the condemnation of God, whenever judgment is passed on it; that which cannot come within God's presence; that which must be excluded from heaven.

On these definitions, it is plain that man's inclination to sin is in itself sin. It is contrary to the will and mind of God. It is the opposite of the idea of man as God created him, and wished him to remain. Whenever God passes judgment on a nature which contains so deep-rooted within it this inclination to sin, He must condemn it as less than perfect, as contrary to His will, as unsuitable to remain in His presence, as excluded from heaven. "Proneness to sin," wrote William Tyndale, "is damnable". Tyndale brought the example of snakes. Men kill snakes because they condemn their nature, long before the snake has bitten them. It is the snake's nature to poison, and this is so even while within the egg. It does not become a snake because it bites, but it bites because it is a snake. So no matter how immature the snake may be, even while it is still unborn, man is its enemy, for it is the enemy of man, for its nature is to poison. Man condemns snakes, whatever degree of development, whether embryo or full grown, which the individual snake has reached. Similarly all humanity—whether infant or full grown, infected as it is with a proneness to sin which becomes actual as soon as opportunity is given—stands under God's eternal condemnation, for it is contrary to His mind and will. This conclusion is fully in line with scripture. The wrath of God abides on all (except those in Christ).¹ Men are by nature sons of disobedience, on whom the wrath of God comes.²

Human sentimentality does not like to think that all men, even the smallest child, have a nature which God must surely condemn; or as the Bible says, on which the wrath of God abides. We dislike to think this about ourselves, that even when we are at our very best we come so far short of God's glory that we must in ourselves be excluded from Heaven where nothing but perfection abides. And if excluded from heaven, nothing but hell remains for us, nothing but the outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of the teeth. Such is the proper portion of all those who share a sinful nature. We do not like the thought, but facts are facts.

Against this background God's grace shines brightly. "God commendeth His own love toward us that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." The love of God is the basis of the Gospel, which is that God will save all that call upon Him. This introduces the subject of

¹ John iii. 36.

² Col. iii. 6; Eph. v. 6; ii. 2.

justification. How is it that any men who are very far gone from original righteousness ever enter heaven? The answer is that when they come up before the judgment seat of God—and this does not wait to the final day, but is an ever present activity—God passes the judgment on them that they are righteous, and thus fit for His presence, now and through eternity. But how is this so; how is it that God, Himself the embodiment of righteousness, can pass a judgment apparently so contrary to the facts? Some theologians resolve the paradox by minimizing sin. They argue that sin is not so grievous a thing but that God may ignore it. One act of compunction is sufficient. The fact that man's nature is awry and not after God's mind is glossed over. Although our natures made us what we are, these thinkers distil the ego from the nature to say that God accepts us because we are not responsible for our natures.

Any minimizing of sin is a step away from the truth, away from the teaching of Jesus. Christ spoke of hell and eternal judgment more frequently than the rest of the New Testament. To seek an explanation of God's justification by glossing over the heinousness of sin is a blind alley. Yet the glorious fact is that God does justify the ungodly. How so?

The Roman Catholic Church gives an answer that God's verdict of just is only given at the completion of a long process of sanctification by which sin is purged out and virtues grown in the soul till at last the human soul attains perfection and is rightly admitted to heaven. The Roman Catholics give the name of justification to this process, which for most sinners is a long one, extending to thousands of years in purgatory. The means by which (according to the Roman Catholics) God works out this process of justification (or as we would say sanctification) are many—the reception of the sacraments, ascetism, pilgrimages, good works of all descriptions. For the Roman Catholics the phrase "God justifies the ungodly" is no paradox but a straightforward, almost platitudinous statement that God makes bad people better.

The Roman Catholic view cannot stand the test of scripture. The word 'justify' does not mean 'make just' but 'declare just'. This has been established beyond doubt lexicographically.

The Bible strictly forbids men to justify the ungodly. "He that justifieth the wicked and he that condemneth the righteous, both of them alike are an abomination to the Lord" (Prov. xvii, 15). But no sacred writer would forbid the making of bad men better, which is the meaning of justify according to the Council of Trent. It is foolish to suggest that the Bible forbids us to make the wicked good. That should be an aim of every Christian. What is forbidden is passing a sentence of just on those not just, yet this is what St. Paul says God does; and the answer St. Paul gives is that God is righteous in doing so, because of Christ's sacrifice.

Space does not allow the examination of the doctrine of the atonement or what it was that Christ endured on the cross. Much of this will always remain unknown to us here. We can glimpse, but cannot fathom as yet (and I hope for all of us never) the awful consequences of sin. But this we may say clearly, from scripture and from experience,

that the result of Christ's death is that men are offered by God salvation, that is to say, forgiveness of their sins, justification, reconciliation, adoption, glorification; and this they may have for the asking.

Justification may be defined as acceptance with God, and the scriptures say that this is offered as a present reality, acceptance now and at the last day. There is little difference in scripture between forgiveness and justification. Both are the result of being "in Christ". Men are justified through being forgiven. God does not take account of the believer's sins. "Blessed is the man whose sins the Lord will not impute." (The Greek is very strong.) God's forgiveness is so complete that our sins are cast into the depth of the sea, cast behind God's back. When we forgive we seldom forget; with God forgiveness is forgetfulness. The Christian stands before his judgment bar without spot or wrinkle, so that there is no question but he is adjudged just. He is justified.

The ultimate ground of our justification is God's character. God is gracious and loving to men. The gracious character of God is revealed in the Old Testament and in the New. In Eden the protevangelium (God's promise of Christ to Adam and Eve) is a proclamation of what God will do for men. In all our Salvation the initiative is with God. At Sinai God revealed Himself as "the Lord, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth. . . ."

The most important fact about the Old Testament sacrificial system was that it was a God-given (and not a man invented) means of reconciliation with God. There were some sins outside the scope of atonement provided by sacrifice. In those cases there was no other way for the penitent but to cast himself on to the same mercy of God that had provided the way of sacrifice. The story of David's repentance is an example. When by means of Nathan's parable he was convicted and confessed "I have sinned", the prophet was able to reply, "the Lord also hath put away thy sin".

So too Elijah told Ahab that the king's repentance had averted the judgment in his days.

It is in the writings of the prophets and in the psalms that this free justification through the graciousness of God is emphasized. Nothing could be plainer than Isaiah 1. 18. "Come now and let us reason together saith the Lord, though your sins be scarlet, they shall be white as snow."¹ Psalm li especially reflects the humility of penitence, and confidence of God's merciful forgiveness, both of which flow from a knowledge of God's unchangeable graciousness: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness, according to the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions".

God is no tyrant in the Old Testament, but a gracious, albeit a just, God. The God of the priests of Baal who cut themselves with knives is not the God of the Christians. The *Curé d'Ars*, flagellating himself till he swooned, was mistaken about God's character. Salvation is free. This is clear in both Testaments. Forgiveness is free to us, but as the homily of the Salvation of Mankind reminds us, it is not free to God.

¹ Cf. Hosea 6. 1, Jer. 31. 33, Ez. 36. 25.

This insight is present in the Old Testament. The sacrificial system was a standing witness to the need of propitiation. In Is. liii the servant of the Lord suffers for others. God has laid on Him our iniquity and with His stripes we are healed.

In the New Testament the doctrine of justification remains unchanged. The Gospel proclaims that God graciously forgives repentant sinners. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Our Lord's parables of the prodigal son and of the pharisee and publican illustrate the truth of this. Both the prodigal and the publican simply confess, with a truly contrite heart, like David, "I have sinned", and they receive immediate and free forgiveness.

But as is natural, the ground of forgiveness, i.e., the propitiating death of Christ, is more prominent in the New Testament than in the Old. Instead of being secondary in thought it has become primary. The simplest faith in Christ saves, e.g., the penitent thief, the paralytic borne of four, and the woman with the issue of blood. In Acts the same salvation through the name of Christ is preached. "In none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12). Paul preached in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia, "Be it known unto you therefore brethren that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins and by him everyone that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13. 34, 39).

The New Testament makes quite clear that the ground of this offer is Christ's death and resurrection. "Christ died for our sins." "He was delivered up on account of our sins and raised on account of our justification." As a result of Christ's work, forgiveness, justification, reconciliation is offered to all men. There is nothing that men can do but accept. God's merciful character and overflowing love is revealed in the gratuitousness of salvation. It is the essence of Christianity. The Church of England homilies declare that a man who denies the doctrine of justification by faith only is not a Christian. St. Paul said the same thing. Those who added any work of theirs to that of Christ "are severed from Christ" (Gal. 5. 4).

God offers justification or complete acceptance in Christ to all who will receive this offer. Those who respond share in the benefits of Christ's death. Their sins are blotted out, their natures are remade, they are born again of the Spirit. They put on Christ and through Him, and only through Him and His righteousness, enter God's presence. All this is the work of God. Any little patch with which we might wish to patch up our own sinfulness is otiose and does despite to Christ's blood by denying the completeness of the redemption He has wrought. Our salvation is God's work from beginning to end and is offered to all, and made effective to all who believe, for unless God works His gracious work in the soul, that soul is lost. The wrath of God abides on him.

We are justified, i.e., accepted by God as sinless, on account of the merits of Christ. Justified by the merits of Christ only and justified by faith only are identical in meaning. Both formulae were used by Cranmer.

Faith is trust, and is directed to God's promises rather than to dogmas. Hence its essence is personal, and is the highest worship that we can offer God. Note, for example, the personal emphasis in the fourfold "given for thee" in the words of distribution in the Communion Service. God offers us salvation which Christ has won. It becomes ours through faith. For faith is not only an attitude but also an action. Christ says, "Come unto me". The coming is faith. Christ says, "I stand at the door and knock. If any man open the door, I will come in". The opening of the door is faith.

Faith is said to justify because faith is the only faculty of the soul which perceives and accepts God's offer and promises of salvation in Christ. Faith justifies not because faith is a virtue so pleasing to God that He rewards it with salvation; but that by faith, and by faith only, we cleave to Christ. None of our virtues is rewarded with salvation, for from beginning to end Salvation is a free gift.

The New Testament often speaks of baptism as justifying. This is because baptism is essentially an act of faith in God's promises of forgiveness. This service depicts by its actions God's inward washing and the uniting of the believer with Christ. The coming to the service and the undergoing of its imagery bodies forth the recipients' faith in those promises of God which the service dramatizes. This faith ensures the fulfilment of those promises. Thus baptism justifies all those who receive it in faith. For baptism is dramatized faith.

Let us turn our attention to the case of infants. If any infant enters heaven it must be because God has forgiven it its sinful nature, and moreover changed that nature by the new birth. For except a man be born again he cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

I suppose no one will stay to argue that God cannot regenerate an infant. But the question is, does He regenerate all infants who, e.g., die in infancy? Are all "born again" by virtue of their tender years?

I believe that God normally forgives the sins and regenerates in baptism only those infants for whom prayer is made, that is to say, children of Christian parents who by virtue of birth are members of the covenant and are God's already (1 Cor. 7. 14). The prayers and faith of the parents of such infants is not disregarded. There is no difference between infants and adults. All are justified by faith and by faith alone. And if infants are justified by faith, then it is entirely appropriate that they should receive baptism, the sacrament of faith, and that the faith which justifies them should be expressed in the service which Christ instituted for this purpose.

The Secular Reaction and Its Legacy

BY "HISTORICUS"

A FREQUENT argument of agnostics is expressed thus : " Christians may have been responsible for some of the social reforms of the last century, but they did not go far enough. Nor, as man developed in wisdom and experience, was their faith any longer necessary or even desirable ". In support of this it is asserted that though Shaftesbury, Booth, Barnardo and the others did much to alleviate the condition of the masses, the true leaders of Reform were the agnostics—Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Bernard Shaw and the Fabians. The Labour Movement, as it grew, shed its Christianity. Therefore, claims the agnostic, whatever his politics, Christianity may be part of the truth, but it is not itself *the* Truth.

Twenty years ago or more, in the nineteen twenties and 'thirties, this argument was not easily answered—not, at least, to the satisfaction of the non-Christian. Surely, however, to-day in the 'fifties one of the strongest arguments for the truth of Christianity lies in a study of this Secular Reaction of the past seventy-five years, from which we are now emerging. The present state of England is one of the clearest proofs of the truth of Christianity which we possess.

Back in the eighteen-seventies, Christianity was apparently secure. The Evangelical Movement was strong and held the initiative. The Oxford Movement was advancing, but in its basis it still owed much to evangelicalism, and most of its leaders had evangelical backgrounds. Churchgoing was normal, missionary enterprise was drawing men and women on an extending scale. The conventions of morality were clearly Christian, and to offend them entailed social ostracism. In public life, many of the leading men were active and thoroughgoing Christians—Gladstone and Selborne, Granville and the Duke of Argyll among Liberals, Cairns, Salisbury and Adderley among Conservatives, to name only a few. At the other end of the scale, Christianity held the loyalties of most of the industrial population, especially in the north. Sunday was a national institution; most homes held family prayers and said grace at meals as a matter of course.

Even forty years ago, in the years immediately before the First World War, the structure of national Christianity seemed equally secure and, although standards were lower, the churches normally were full.

What, therefore, happened? The agnostic would claim that the Secular Reaction was inevitable: " Christianity is an unscientific religion and therefore was bound to lose hold." It is not necessary to be content with this answer.

The two most obvious lines on which Christianity was attacked do not need detailed repetition. Science, in the years following the controversy at the British Association of 1860, was taking an increasingly agnostic tone, while Higher Criticism, at its most destructive

stage, was undermining faith in the authority of Scripture. From this sprang the militant atheism of Bradlaugh and his disciples, the "Religion of Humanity" propagated by Comte and Frederic Harrison, the various pseudo-Christianities of men such as Matthew Arnold, and the Hedonism associated with Walter Pater (who was, in his own morals most virtuous) and Oscar Wilde (who was not).

All this, however, was limited to small though noisy sections of the highly educated upper middle class. That it was a small section is evident from the number of scientists who were not Darwinians, nor agnostics. At Cambridge alone the leaders of science in the later nineteenth century were all prominent Christians—Sedgwick, Stokes, Cayley, Adams, MacAlister and many others. The English masses, moreover, were largely untouched by this agnosticism.

The structure seemed secure. Yet before many decades, Christianity appeared, to a new generation, to have been doomed inevitably. In the seventies it often required a measure of courage to be an open agnostic. Among younger men in the Edwardian period, despite lip-service, it required a measure of courage to be a convinced Christian. The attack from science and Higher Criticism is not sufficient explanation for this change. The answer must be sought at a deeper level.

Most of the answer lies in the Victorian home. Family prayers, grace, Sunday observance were the order of the day. But too easily these became the impositions of Law instead of the natural reaction of Liberty. What the parents had adopted as the result of settled conviction they imposed upon their children. Often these things had been adopted merely from convention. Thus abuse was frequent: "Needless to say we too had family prayers every morning", writes Percy Colson, "This rite took place after breakfast was brought in and we thought with anguish of kidney and bacon getting cold while my father prayed fast and furiously, keeping one eye open for any signs of inattention on our part. He was always in a vile temper before breakfast, the result, I suppose, of the cold bath he took, whatever the weather. . . ." As for grace before meat, writes Laurence Housman, "it did not inculcate the thankful spirit. What we were about to receive were very often the shortcomings of the cook, and we were *not* thankful. Complaint was immediate and loud".

It could be the same with Sunday. Thus the young Alexander Irvine in his Scottish childhood, was caught by his father whistling a Moody and Sankey hymn tune on the Sabbath: "Shut up yer mook!" "It's a hymn tune," protested the boy. "I don't care a d——. It's the Lord's Day and if I hear yor whistlin' in it I'll whale the life out o' ye."

Many children suffered also from an especially dangerous product of debased Christianity—the threat of hell-fire as punishment for wrong doing, which was often as not mere disobedience to the dictates of nurse or parent. They thus grew to believe that heaven and hell depended on works, not on grace or its rejection, and inevitably they came to look on God as an Angry Old Man.

In addition, the Christianity of Victorian homes, whether heartfelt or conventional, was superimposed on current faults. The prudery associated with 'Victorian' was present long previously and was not

a creation of eighteenth or nineteenth century evangelicals. "The officiating minister," wrote an eminent judge in 1858, describing his son's wedding service, "was a puseyite and a great stickler for the Rubrick. So we had the whole of that prolix, strange and not over decent ceremonial, to the last syllable, and a young lady of nineteen was publickly told in the presence of several much younger ladies, that she was married to prevent her from doing worse, and in order that she might be got with child". Similarly, mistaken ideas on the up-bringing of children were mixed in the minds of victims with the religion of those who imposed them, and excessive use of rod and cane was normal long before the evangelical revival. In Victorian times most schoolmasters were clergymen, and children who were unhappy at school often as they grew up turned in loathing from everything which reminded them of school, religion included.

All sorts of abuses and debasements were linked in the minds of the younger generation with Christianity; yet Christianity was not responsible. The tension between Law and Liberty, the stiffness of convention and the sensitiveness of parents to the praise or criticism of their neighbours, the legacy of the past, and the reluctance of parents to let their children make mistakes and to find their own level, each contributed towards a tendency to reaction rather than imitation. Hence in many evangelical families the second generation did not follow the first. Sir (Stevenson) Arthur Blackwood was a great evangelist; his son, Algernon, the writer, was not even a convinced Christian. C. F. G. Masterman, the liberal statesman, who came from an evangelical home, for years professed agnosticism, though eventually returning to Christianity. Sir Robert Morant, the great educationalist, was another, who did not return. On the other hand, the family of Hudson Taylor, the Studds, the Buxtons, and innumerable other families, can show a succession of devoted Christians in generation after generation.

The key surely was personal conversion. Where the younger generation experienced a true, deep conversion, all was well. Where they did not, reaction from the atmosphere of home blended with the current intellectual atmosphere to produce a gradual alienation from Christianity.

This trend can be worked out in the lives of many post-Victorian figures. Somerset Maugham, both in his autobiography and in the novel *Of Human Bondage* describes his own reaction from the religiousness of his high church uncle and guardian, and his subsequent scientific rationalism. Beatrice Webb in *My Apprenticeship* shows how near she came to conversion under the influence of the noted evangelical, Philip Eliot, later Dean of Windsor; and how beneath the outward agnosticism of her later life ran the pathetic search for a personal God. "Like so many poor souls," she wrote in the 'twenties, "I have the consciousness of being a spiritual outcast. I have failed to solve the problems of life".

Many, especially from evangelical homes, took a different course and entered the Roman Church, finding there the authority over their lives which they believed the Bible no longer could give and for which they yearned. Others, perhaps the most, became liberal humanists,

accepting the ethics of a Christianity, the creeds of which they rejected. "He told me all his views about Christianity," wrote Sir Edward Grey to his wife after talking with her father in 1888, "and they are exactly the same as yours and mine; i.e., no doctrine, but taking Christ's teaching as the best platform of morality that has been laid down". And though Grey returned to somewhat more definite Christian beliefs in later life, his words are typical of his generation, and reveal much of its strength and grave weakness.

By the Edwardian period, the generation which had reacted from evangelicalism was at the height of its influence. The decline of Christianity was scarcely realized, but it was mirrored in a contrast of the Liberal Cabinets of 1906 with that of Gladstone thirty years before. Asquith, Haldane, Morley, to name only three, had all passed to a more or less agnostic liberal humanism; Lloyd George had shed the militant evangelism which had brought him his first fame as a "boy preacher". In the Labour Party, although the Christianity of many of its leaders was still active, the Fabians were already gaining the initiative. In the country as a whole the secular reaction, which was passing through the educated classes to the masses, was given fresh impetus by the rise of the scientific novelists. H. G. Wells and his imitators had caught the ear of the vast new reading public created by the Education Act of 1870, and H. G. Wells was convinced that "God was a lie". Wells was creating a splendid new universe in which God seemed unnecessary, and the brilliance of his imagination and the fascination of his novels gave his views the widest hearing. What Herbert Spencer had done for the educated, Wells did for the masses.

Against this, contemporary Christianity had little to offer. In the Churches, Anglo-Catholicism and Modernism held the initiative. The older Evangelicals were frankly on the defensive, many of the younger were drifting to liberalism. The Churches were torn with controversies. Although there were areas where Christianity was virile, even as thirty years previously there were patches of paganism, the structure of English religion was wearing thin. It was little more than a facade—strong on the surface, but rotten within. It needed merely a jolt to bring the structure down.

The jolt came with the War of 1914. Memoirs and memories of the period testify to the grievous loss of faith which the Great War caused. In any war there will be front-line conversions, and a true, deep faith will survive the worst that war can do, but life in the trenches more often than not left a man stripped of the conventionalities and half-faiths which he had accepted as religion, and hardened against further impressions. No example exists more pathetic or more bitter than Robert Graves' *Good-bye to All That*.

With the coming of peace the extent of the Secular Reaction was clearly revealed. The War had made a break with the past. Morals were loosened; family life had been broken. Liberal Humanism, with its early promise that the War had ended Wars, had bred a ready optimism. Pseudo-religions—Christian Science, Spiritualism—had thrived on the perplexities and sufferings of the bereaved. "Orthodox" Christianity gave ready acquiescence to the easy belief that death

in battle gave a right to heaven : " These laid down their lives for king and country ", runs the memorial in the Queen's Chapel of the Savoy, " and now are beholding the King in His beauty and are satisfied ".

To the young of those days, who had been brought up to the conventionalities of Edwardian life and religion and had matured in the crucible of war, the old order had gone for ever. Christianity was not merely exploded ; it had become the enemy, to be attacked with bitterness and derision. The " wild " 'twenties and the early 'thirties formed an age of dogma, but the dogma was that of Scientific Humanism. Science and Progress were the criteria by which beliefs and actions were judged. In religion, liberalism enjoyed its heyday. Of conservative evangelicals, some were uncertain of their position, others fought an apparently losing battle (by human standards) against the prevalent antipathies of the period.

The most important consequence of the post-war attitude to Christianity was felt in the home. The men and women of the War generation had been given a grounding in the Christian faith, and normally they had been sent to Sunday School and to church, whatever the personal loyalties of their parents. In the Twenties they were bringing up their own families. But they were no longer bound by pre-war conventions, and more often than not gave their own children no such grounding in the faith. Not only were family prayers, grace and Sunday observance discarded, but also Sunday School and Church. By the outbreak of the Second War the older children of these paganized homes were themselves beginning to marry and have children. At the present day, with these children now in their 'teens, the nation is beginning to reap the bitter fruits of the Secular Reaction.

The Second World War, however, had no such effect as the First. ' Religion ' was better received by 1945 than it had been in '39. The reaction from Darwinism is in full swing, though as yet it has not permeated to the masses. The Bible can no longer be dismissed as a hotch-potch of mythology, sentimentality and ethics, and the young can no longer be fobbed off with rationalist arguments which doped their fathers. Religious controversy has slackened. In the nation as a whole, antipathies have been replaced partly by indifference, partly by a somewhat listless desire to discover the truth.

In the perplexities of the post-war world the cry is for Security, Certainty and Direction. Science cannot give it, for Science is no longer held infallible. Liberalism has been proved false, Humanism unreliable. Everything seems in flux. But the true evangelical faith stands as a rock. The Bible proves its ancient power ; Jesus Christ shows Himself the same to-day as ever. Justification by Faith shows itself the doctrine which the years have not destroyed. The Gospel, fearlessly proclaimed, has power and authority, while other powers and authorities have waned.

Twenty years ago this was difficult to see. Christians believed in the power of the Gospel ; those outside found it hard to believe, and to come within the fold. The young had no use for Christianity. But to-day it is the young who are leading their elders back to Christ.

The present position, therefore, its cause, its dangers and its hopes,

provide a strong argument for the truth of Christianity. A thoughtful man, not yet a Christian, may be brought to consider the Secular Reaction and its consequences, and can form his own judgment. He will see how the Post-Victorians, reacting from the faith of their fathers, struck for a better world, but one in which Christian doctrine should have no place. He will see the grievous results of this false hope. He must consider the position to-day—ethical, national, personal. He should read such books as Sir Leo Page's *The Young Lag* (Faber 1950) : "He has no religion," so Page sums up the outlook of young offenders (p. 272), "No faith, no inspiration. As a materialist he judges rewards and punishments by wholly materialist standards and conceptions. That he would find any satisfaction or contentment in living honestly for the mere reason that it is right to be honest and wrong to be dishonest he regards as absurd. . . ."

By strict study of modern history the thoughtful man should see the grievous result of the Secular Reaction. He will see also that Religion is not enough ; what so often in the world passes for Christianity is not enough. The evidence leads to one conclusion : that nothing is true but the Truth—the gospel of the Grace of God, the knowledge of Christ Who said, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life".

The Bible and the Pulpit

BY THE REV. ALAN M. STIBBS, M.A.

MUCH modern preaching is weak and ineffective, disappointing and unconvincing, because of a lack in the preacher of adequate conviction concerning the place of the Bible in the pulpit. Those of us who are called to this task of preaching greatly need a new awakening to, and a consequent compelling awareness of, the character of our stewardship. For, "*it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful*" (1 Corinthians iv. 2).

I

The Christian preacher has something unique to offer to men—the proclamation that God has acted in human history, both to reveal Himself and to redeem mankind. So our Gospel for men ought not to be found in human philosophy and man-made ideas, and still less in our personal preferences and prejudices, but in the declaration of God's self-revealing and saving acts.

These acts of God, because they are acts in history, possess the character of particularity and once-for-all-ness. God is not repeating them in each fresh generation. If, therefore, they are to fulfil their universal and age-long purpose of speaking to all men, and bringing to them light and hope, worthy record, appropriate interpretation and effective announcement of them are indispensable. Nor has God left such necessary complementary ministries to chance. Prophets and

apostles were raised up of God to provide both the record and the interpretation, and preachers are continually being called to utter the Word of God thus entrusted to them in living application to the present generation—and all under the compulsion and enlightenment of the inspiring Spirit.

"Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets"; so Amos saw. "The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" so Amos spoke. Such particular confessions indicate and illustrate the general method of divine revelation. God's special acts in history to reveal and to redeem have also been accompanied by the raising up of prophets to record and to interpret. Their words, significantly fixed in permanent written form, are for all subsequent generations doubly indispensable. Without them the acts of God would not be known; still more without them the acts of God would never be understood and appreciated in all their unique and supernatural significance.

What was true of the preparatory disclosures of God in Old Testament times when He spoke to men "by divers portions and in divers manners", here a little and there a little, is still more true of the crowning act of revelation and the final work of redemption through the incarnation of God the Son. Through special chosen witnesses God, acting in sovereign providence, secured the writing down of a record of these events of revelation and redemption in ways which throw into relief their true significance, together with a fuller interpretation for the responsive of truths concerning God and man therein revealed. The writings thus inspired also provided manifold indication both of the dynamic outworking of the benefits of this Gospel in the lives of men, and of the final consummation in which it will inevitably issue. Thus the New Testament Scriptures were added to the Old.

It is through these Scriptures and through these alone that the true God can now be known and His saving purposes for men discerned. Here only can we find the true Christ in all the fulness of both His divine person and His saving work. To quote Dr. Alan Richardson, "The Christian understanding of historical revelation is that it was given through certain historical events as interpreted by the faith and insight of the prophets and apostles of the Bible". "Christians believe that the perspective of biblical faith enables us to see very clearly and without distortion the biblical facts as they really are." "The interpretation of the biblical facts, as it was given to them by those who recorded them in the biblical history and apostolic witness, is necessary to a true seeing of the facts themselves."¹

What is more, it is God's further complementary purpose that in each fresh generation and in every Christian congregation this written testimony should fulfil its illuminating and saving ministry among men through the present confirming witness of God the Spirit, and through the Spirit-enabled exposition and relevant practical application of the written Word by the faithful preacher. So these three should agree in one common witness to convince the hearer—the written Word, the illuminating Spirit and the faithful preacher. But

¹ *Christian Apologetics*, pp. 92, 105.

here, too, since the preacher is the appointed "voice" to give utterance, if he does not fall into proper line in his ministry, not only is the Word of God not heard, but men are compelled to listen to a disappointing counterfeit. "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed."

It is, therefore, for the man who would worthily occupy the Christian pulpit to recognize, first, that he is called to serve God and to promote God's glory and men's good by preaching Christ; second, that he is called to serve Christ and to present Him truly and fully to men by preaching that Word which has been written to set Him forth; third, that he is called to serve God the Spirit by seeking His guidance, and following His illumination and leading, both in discovering within the written Word the truth of God which is relevant, and in declaring its relevance to his waiting audience; and fourth, that he is therefore called by the whole Trinity, Father, Son and Spirit, to serve God by becoming a servant of the written Word, a man whose utterances are wholly determined both in content and aim by the written Word's plain statements, and not by his own independent prejudices and preferences.

Would that the many who enter Christian pulpits week by week could be made to feel the amazing wonder of their high privilege, and the full burden of their solemn responsibility, as ministers of the God-given Word. Then they would unquestionably give a new priority to the worthy discharge of their stewardship. Nor is there any one accession that many congregations need more than the advent of a preacher who, in the face of all the temptations to do otherwise, can but re-echo the apostle Paul's words, "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel" (1 Corinthians ix. 16).

II

Such use of the Bible in the pulpit by the preacher is not likely to be adopted, and still less to be faithfully maintained in season and out of season, unless the preacher is convinced of, and compelled by, certain fundamental truths and consequent obligations with regard to his task. Let us, therefore, seek to make ourselves aware of some of these more in detail.

(A)

The preacher ought always to be constrained by the recollection that the Church is "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ". To quote the late Professor E. J. Bicknell, "The Church exists to propagate certain beliefs. . . . Her message is sufficiently set forth in Scripture. . . . Her primary function is that of witness. . . . As witness she cannot alter or add to the truth: she is the servant and not the mistress of her message."¹

Before a congregation of Christian believers the preacher who would be faithful has, therefore, no right to choose what he will say according to his own fancy or personal interest, nor to make brief quotations from the Scriptures serve as pegs on which to hang his own ideas. In the pulpit, if he is to be true to his calling, he must be a minister or servant of the God-given Word. He should make it his business solely to set

¹ *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 317f.

forth for men's edification what can be got out of God's Word written rather than what can be independently devised by the initiative of his own reasoning or imagination.

In this connection there is arresting and appropriate significance in the custom which obtains in some Reformed Churches, that before the minister enters the pulpit the Bible should be solemnly carried in and placed upon the rostrum, as a visible sign and freshly acted witness that the Holy Scriptures are the one authoritative text-book that is revered, and that is to be read and expounded, in this congregation.

On the other hand, with us "a text" has come to mean something short, something which belongs to the preacher—"his text"—something which, because it is more or less just an indication or introduction of his subject, he can use or depart from, as he will. Such a preacher makes the Word serve his ends instead of himself becoming a true servant of the Word. Whereas originally and properly the word "text" (as in the reference to the text of ancient manuscripts) describes simply the actual statements to be found in the Holy Scriptures in any particular passage, whether short or long; and the proper business of its preacher is to stick to that passage, and to set forth exclusively what it has to say or to suggest, so that the ideas expressed and the principles enunciated during the course of the sermon are plainly derived from the written Word of God, and have its authority for their support and enforcement rather than just the opinion or enthusiasm of their human expositor.

It is thus the preacher's privilege and responsibility continually to bring his hearers into the light and under the judgment of the God-given Word. To quote Professor Oscar Cullmann, "The written witness of the Apostles is for us the living element which continually sets us anew face to face with Christ. If we realize the magnitude of this miracle . . . we can no longer speak of the dead letter of the Bible. Yet this presupposes that we share the faith of the first Christians that the Apostles are not writers like other authors of antiquity, but men set apart by God for the execution of His plan of salvation by their witness, first oral, then written." "The apostolic witness has a double role: it engenders inspiration and acts as its controller, since in all inspiration there is a risk of other spirits putting themselves in the place of the Holy Spirit."¹

Here we sometimes need deliverance from prevailing but misleading traditional interpretation of Scripture. For instance, in His condemnation of the rabbinic interpretation of the commandment to honour father and mother (Mark vii. 9-13), as well as in the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount, our Lord was significantly indicating "the necessity of returning to the Word itself to get from it the divine intention".²

On the other hand, we equally and more often need deliverance from the temptation to impair the distinctive witness of the God-given Word through following some prevailing fashion of academic scholar-

¹ "Scripture and Tradition," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (June 1953), pp. 119, 121.

² *Ibid.*, p. 123.

ship or popular thought. For instance, "If the texts have to be manipulated previously, when historical witnesses are interpreted as myths, or when the scholar decides beforehand how much of the text he is to regard as 'eternal truth' and how much as 'historically conditioned' and therefore valueless material, the experience he looks forward to will not be related to the God of our salvation but rather to the theologian's own views of what salvation ought to be".¹ Or again, "In our eagerness to evangelize, we may actually distort the Gospel by identifying it with a programme or ideology which is already acceptable". "To make the Gospel relevant according to our views of relevancy is to manipulate God's revelation to suit ourselves—but then we do not allow God to speak to us in His own way."² If, therefore, God's voice is to be properly heard in the congregation of His people the preacher must be a whole-hearted and uncompromising servant and expositor of the God-given Word.

(B)

The preacher should believe and become increasingly aware that there is a vital Christian significance for present-day hearers to be found in Scriptures written long ago. This particularly applies to the Old Testament—as the apostle Paul explicitly and repeatedly testifies.³ These Scriptures can and should mean more to us than they did or could to the men of Old Testament times; for we live in the light and experience of their Christian fulfilment. Also, they were written for our instruction; they have been divinely prepared and provided for our benefit, to help our understanding and enjoyment of salvation through faith in Christ. For instance, "St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 11) says that the events of the Exodus happened to Israel *τυπικῶς*—by way of type." "For the exodus-theme (with its associated thoughts) provides the clue for the interpretation of each successive stage in God's redeeming acts." "The earlier story not only shows a correspondence with the later; it provides the imagery, the authoritative categories, by which alone the true meaning of the later can be understood."⁴ Therefore the Old Testament stories ought to be used and expounded as divinely provided material for the better preaching and appreciation of Christ and the Gospel.

In this connection, as Professor C. H. Dodd has significantly shown,⁵ striking illustration of this method of exposition is to be found in the use of the Old Testament which is made by the New Testament writers. According to their judgment through the ancient Scriptures the Holy Spirit speaks to us "to-day" (see e.g., Heb. iii. 7ff). They appealed to the ancient Scriptural history and statement to confirm the divine origin of, and to interpret the divine purpose in, the events of the Gospel or the experience of Christians. Paul thus "found a securer

¹ Professor Otto A. Piper, "Mysticism and Christian Experience", *Theology To-day*, July 1953, p. 168.

² Hugh T. Kerr, Jr., "Revelation and Relevancy", *ibid.*, pp. 145, 147.

³ See Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 15-17; cf. 1 Pet. i. 10-12.

⁴ W. M. F. Scott, "The Christian Use of the Old Testament", *The Churchman*, Vol. lxi, No. 4 (Dec. 1947), p. 177f.

⁵ *According to the Scriptures*, Nisbet, 1952.

basis than his own 'experience' for the theology he taught". "He expressly bases his theology upon the *kerygma* as illuminated by the prophecies of the Old Testament ; or, in other words, upon the historical facts which he had 'received' from competent witnesses, set in the larger historical framework, witnessed, both as fact and as meaning, by the prophetic writers."¹

Appreciation of the place and need for this kind of preaching use of the Old Testament in our pulpits is the more urgent because the literary and historical criticism of the Old Testament, engaged in by ordinands in training more than by others, has developed in the preachers-to-be of our churches a critical scientific attitude to the Old Testament documents, and has actually inhibited rather than encouraged their use of these Scriptures in the way in which a Christian preacher should handle them. For "the Bible has become too much a book for specialists ; a book on the serious discussion of which men are hesitant to embark, lest they trespass on some technical preserve, and be condemned out of hand for some highly technical errors". "It is the great immediate loss produced by the historical study of the Bible that it has destroyed the old common believing use of the Bible."²

Preachers, therefore, need to return to a proper Christian attitude to the Old Testament, and to a proper believing use of it in Christian preaching and teaching. What is more, to get to the root of the matter, men being trained as preachers in the theological colleges need to be set free from absorption in the study of the prevailing scientific and historical criticism of the Old Testament, which is for them not only so largely profitless but also so grievously deadening ; and encouraged to study the Old Testament with its Christian application and use fully in view.

(C)

The preacher ought to prepare for his task as one who believes that it is within the Canon of the Old and New Testament Scriptures that God's present Word for men is still to be found and heard ; and that it is through the faithful exposition and vital application of these Scriptures to the congregation that this present Word of God is to be expressed, and made living and intelligible to men, by the quickening and illuminating Spirit. This means in practice that, when considering what to preach, the preacher-to-be will prayerfully wait upon God with and in His Word. In other words, it is to the Scriptures that he will turn ; it is in them he will tarry ; it is at them he will toil ; constrained by the belief, and encouraged by the unfailingly renewed experience, that God still has much light waiting to break forth from and through His written Word.

Not only so ; he will seek in this way the more exclusively and diligently to discover the message to be preached, because he knows it to be his calling thus to minister the God-given word rather than to give to men what they may imagine, or what he may think, they need. For neither the people in the pews, nor the man in the pulpit are the best judges of what is truly relevant to the needs of the congregation.

¹ *Ibid*, p. 135.

² H. Cunliffe-Jones, *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation*, p. 35.

Men and women, living as we all do so sinfully and selfishly, need the breaking in from outside of a word announcing a staggering objective truth, relevant to us because we are inevitably related to it, and of such a kind as will alter our whole present circumstance and our whole future behaviour. The Christian preacher should be like a telegraph messenger bringing to the hearer in person, and not least to the wholly indifferent and unsuspecting, the kind of news that completely alters his position and his prospects—like the bringing to light of evidence making one chargeable with a capital offence, or the news of the death of a relative by whose will one is richly to benefit, provided one goes to live on his estate. Such is the news which the preacher is called to find for men in the God-given Word, and commissioned authoritatively to give to men in God's Name.

(D)

The preacher can only adequately discharge his responsibility if he recognizes that he is called to preach the whole Bible and the Christ of all the Scriptures. There is no justification for deliberately leaving some out or carelessly disregarding its witness. In a sermon on 2 Timothy iii. 16, 17, John Calvin wrote: "That no man might take the liberty to choose what he pleaseth and so obey God in part, St. Paul saith the whole Scripture hath this majesty of which he speaketh, and that it is all profitable. . . . When he speaketh of the Holy Scripture, . . . he doth mean the Old Testament. . . . Thus we perceive that his mind was that the law and the prophets should always be preached in the Church of Christ". Or, to quote two modern writers: "In any merely human system of truth . . . obsolete ideas are discarded, new ideas are incorporated in the light of fresh discoveries. But no part of the divine revelation can ever become out of date, nor does it need to be supplemented from outside. Hence the place assigned to Scripture".¹ And again, "The Bible is a vehicle of revelation, and it is not open to a believer to select from it only such passages as suit his personal taste".² So the faithful steward of the mysteries of God must preach the Scriptures, the whole Scriptures, and nothing but the Scriptures.

III

One last word needs to be added. Such preaching requires in the preacher personal qualifications of a moral and spiritual order in the realm of his own faith in Christ and his own obedience to God's Word. To the proclamation of the message the effective preacher, whom the Spirit uses to enlighten and to inspire men, commonly sets the seal of his own testimony that God's Word is true. This he does both by the confession of his lips and by the correspondence of his life. For the God-given Word is made by the Spirit present saving Gospel to the hearer who believes, as it is preached with conviction and urgency by the man who himself believes it and has experienced its power. Similarly the God-given Word becomes challenging and compelling teaching to the hearer, who is prepared to obey, as it is presented in

¹ E. J. Bicknell, *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 317.

² W. J. Phythian-Adams, *The People and the Presence*, p. 86.

exposition and exhortation by the man who has himself worked out its meaning and entered into its practical application in his own daily living.

By all means, therefore, let us preach the Word, in season and out of season. In other words, in the pulpit let us confine ourselves to Biblical exposition. For we are stewards of divinely-revealed truth ; and "*it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful*". But to our faithful stewardship let us add faith in our divine Fellow-Worker and the obedience of wondering fellow-workmen. Let us, as we preach, ourselves be doers of the Word and not preachers only. Let us, as we preach, never cease to believe that, if the Word be God-given, He will cause it to prosper in the thing whereto He sends it. Such labour cannot be in vain.

A Christian Interpretation of Disease

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR R. K. HARRISON, PH.D.

ONE of the most sinister facts which confronts mankind at the present day is that of disease. Wherever we turn we can recognize its activity and its progress within human experience. In an environment where the regulations for public health are widely observed, the advantages which the average person experiences as a result may tend to obscure to a greater or lesser degree the true picture of disease and its ravages in the modern world. The rate at which hospitals are being erected for various therapeutic purposes by no means matches the increase of disease, though it does in one sense indicate the concern with which the disease-situation is being approached.

The problem has been aggravated considerably by the last World War where, for example, in Europe, and especially in Britain, the scourge of tuberculosis was well under control until the beginning of the War. As a result, we have to face the hard fact that many of the advances made during the last decade or more have been obliterated by the dramatic increase of those diseases which were previously restricted in their scope. On the American continent, which happily was spared the horror and devastation of physical devastation by bombing during the late war, there are still a great many problems attaching to disease which are as yet unsolved.¹ The principal malignant states from which people there are dying comprise, in order, cardiac diseases, cancer and other malignant tumours, nephritis, pneumonia and tuberculosis.

We must bear in mind the fact that remarkable advances have been made in the field of public health and the prevention and cure of diseases which hitherto were held to be intractable. The mortality rate of many diseases has declined significantly over the last few years, as with scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhoid fever and bronchitis, which

in an earlier period were often fraught with grave consequences. The discoveries of medicine and surgery have been augmented by the widespread use of the modern antibiotic drugs, whilst the greater use of preventive techniques and the wide extension of hospital services have assisted materially in lessening the gravity of the problem which disease presents.

But against all this must be set the fact that an ominously large list of diseases yet remains to be mastered or prevented, including the familiar cancerous conditions, circulatory disorders, arthritis and the like, to say nothing of such social problems as venereal disease. This again takes no cognisance of child and maternal health, adequate care for the aged and infirm, and the overall considerations of environment, which are so frequently important aetiological factors in the total picture of disease.

Furthermore, there are increasing reports that bacteria and viruses of certain species are becoming more and more resistant to many of the recent antibiotic drugs, which presents a difficulty not merely for the total mastery of the pathological situation, but also for the patient to whom the drugs are administered.²

In these days we are apt to be very concerned at the virulence and spread of some diseases which were comparatively rare in occurrence until recent times, without realizing that perhaps they are not nearly so modern as we commonly imagine, and also that their incidence in previous generations may have occasioned the demise of the patient without the diseased state being properly diagnosed. It is a fact that the number of "new" diseases is very small, and that for centuries disease has exercised an important influence in society, even to the degeneration of racial stock and the rise and fall of nations.³

For the Christian, disease is a particular problem, owing to its important theological and social ramifications. It is a challenge to our professed interest in the welfare of society in purely practical terms, as well as posing us with spiritual and theological questions as to the rationale of disease and evil, to which so often we do not seem to have any practical or convincing answer. How often have the best of us been involved in this kind of situation, when visiting the sick, for example, and found ourselves either without an answer to the deepest needs of the sufferer, or else offering some trite and half-hearted assurance of Divine love which we either really disbelieved owing to the circumstances, or which seemed to lack the conviction so necessary for the meeting of a specific need. The Clergy, it must be admitted, do not as a whole distinguish themselves at the sickbed, either by the attitude which they adopt towards sickness, or by the general ministrations which they offer to the sufferer. We have been, in the main, reluctant to leave behind the old Cartesian dualism which in a developed pre-Reformation form assigned the body to the physician, and the soul to the priest. As a result we have ignored the implications of the Reformation for this extremely important aspect of thought and life, and we frequently commit in consequence the gross error of viewing a "sick body and a healthy soul" when we observe one who is ill, and then we wonder why our attempts to deal with the situation are so paltry and ineffective.

Further confusion arises from such sources as the Anglican Prayer Book, which in its ministrations to the sick reflects the medieval thought that sickness is in some way the will of God for the sufferer, and the result of some wrongdoing or other. These concepts are in clear contradiction to the New Testament teachings, which never for one moment countenanced physical or mental pathology either as the punishment for sin, or as the specific will of the Deity for the sufferer.⁴

Modern psychosomatic medicine has furnished us with a new outlook upon many traditionally accepted diseases by showing that the emotions play a large part in the incidence of pathological states. Authorities in this field have shown that many illnesses of mind and body which afflict human beings have their origin in mental and spiritual states which are not infrequently marked by a conflict with environmental factors, and which may arise in the last resort from the depths of the human personality.⁵

But what the Christian who is concerned about these matters needs over and above the ill-digested pronouncements of psychiatry or psychology which are so current, is an approach to the disease-situation which will help to account for its nature and incidence, and which will also throw some light on the way in which its activity can be controlled. One feels that this is an important requirement because the traditional approach of the Christian Church has not generally had that specific personal efficacy which the situation demands of the application of the work of Christ to life. Indeed, there are Christian individuals and groups alike who labour under the tragic delusion that their responsibility to the sick has been discharged when we have supervised the building and staffing of sufficient hospitals and sanatoria. When this is accepted as the aim of medical missionary work, as is unfortunately the case all too often, the situation is indeed critical.

In this article we shall attempt to see disease in its historical perspective, and to trace its earliest manifestations on the earth in order to discern something of its intrinsic nature and the possibilities of intervening in the disease-situation to limit its activity by dealing with it from a spiritual point of view.

If disease has in fact had the important social and economic influence for a considerable number of centuries, which we have hinted at above, its antiquity may readily be established by our success in discerning its presence in early civilizations and races of men. That specific ailments with which modern society is familiar were also prominent amongst the peoples of antiquity has been vividly shown in recent years by the science of paleopathology, which was applied to the embalmed bodies of the ancient Egyptians unearthed by archaeological discovery. Sir Marc Armand Ruffer has brought the bulk of Egyptian pathology to light through post-mortem observation of the mummies, and by demonstrating characteristic lesions in the tissues.⁶

Professors Wood Jones and Elliot Smith also examined the bodies of these ancient peoples, and found many cases of such diseases as osteo-arthritic degeneration in the synovial membranes, ligaments, and even the cartilages of affected joints,⁷ whilst reduced and splinted fractures were commonly observed.⁸ The Egyptians suffered, amongst other things, from carcinoma, epilepsy, tuberculosis, blood pressure,

rheumatism, eye ailments and characteristic female disorders.

Though material for paleopathological investigation is not so abundant in Mesopotamia as in the dry sands of Egypt, it appears probable that the ancient Sumerians and Babylonians were aggravated by ailments which seem to have been in existence for some centuries previously. Malaria was doubtless common in the swampy areas, whilst leprosy and smallpox reach back to hoar antiquity. The Gilgamesh Epic, dated about the second millennium B.C., seems to indicate that erysipelas or perhaps malignant tertian malaria was the actual affliction sustained by Gilgamesh, whilst his friend may have had septicaemia, or perhaps even syphilis.⁹ The lack of specific details makes diagnosis very tentative in Babylonian, as also in Biblical literature, and this fact has always to be borne in mind.

The close connection of all ancient diseases with magic is exhibited very clearly in the pathology of primitive man. Disease was uncompromisingly regarded as evil, and came either from bewitching by an injured neighbour, or else it was a divine punishment for human impropriety, often comprising a broken tabu.¹⁰ Probably the greatest insight into the aetiology of disease on the part of the early races of man was that it must be understood primarily as a visitation of divine power, either for a specific transgression or for sins of omission, and that it could only be counteracted by propitiation or by means of magic.¹¹

Early man felt himself caught up in a tremendous struggle between good and evil, and consequently it was almost inevitable that the disadvantageous influences in life should be regarded by him as originating from or being allied to the forces of evil, and as having in themselves the essence of malignity.

Neolithic pathology introduces us to the activity of the shaman or wizard-priest,¹² who used charms, spells and crude surgery to dispel the demons which by their possession of the individual were held to be causing the disease in question. Trephining, or boring a hole in the skull by means of a flint, was a favourite surgical procedure, and as many as five such holes have been found on one skull. The patients appear to have been predominantly women! The cautery was also frequently used on the head in a rough inverted "T" shape, and the amputation of the digits was resorted to in an attempt to appease an angry god.

At this early period in human life it would appear that disease was widely related to a large background of evil, which for them could only be met at an advanced magico-religious level. Whilst these considerations very largely solved the problem of the origin and development of disease from the standpoint of primitive man, they also indicate that disease had acquired a characteristic form which was by no means the product of the immediate moment. In short, disease appears at that time to have been infinitely older than man.

This is distinctly out of harmony with the theology of an earlier age, which regarded moral evil as coming first in the sequence of things, with natural evil taking its rise after the Fall of man.¹³ That disease antedates sin is evident from the many fossil discoveries of pathological states in archaic animals. It would be tedious even to name a selection

of these, but it may be remarked that from the latest period of geological time onwards, the vertebrates were afflicted with diseases of the bones and joints. Moodie¹⁴ and other investigators have stressed the frequency of bone apthology millions of years ago, which in some cases took the form of cancer, or of bony outgrowths. The oldest form of bone cancer yet discovered was found in the tail vertebrae of a dinosaur from the Cretaceous levels of Wyoming, going back millions of years.

Probably the earliest traces of disease lie, not with bone afflictions or with primitive forms of bacteria, but with the associations of the invertebrate species in the form of symbiosis, and more particularly in parasitism. Whereas in symbiosis organisms live together for the common good, in parasitism one preys upon another for its sustenance and shelter, without returning any benefits.¹⁵ Parasitism appears to have been a departure from the earlier norm of symbiosis, and by its activity was predominantly degenerative, as evidenced by fossil remains. As Moodie says,¹⁶ parasitism represents the most elementary form of disease. Now this fact is of great importance in drawing our conclusions about the rationale of disease, because modern pathogenic organisms are generally parasitic, and in investigating the nature of parasitism we are actually enquiring into the nature of disease itself to a significant degree. When it is reduced to its lowest terms as in parasitism, it manifests important characteristics which must now be noticed.

Firstly, disease is an abnormality, and does not contribute to the well-being of the organism. Secondly, it manifests the elements of antagonism or conflict, without which disease does not appear to be able to function effectively. Thirdly, disease has obvious degenerative characteristics and functions, whilst finally, there is the mechanism of the whole sequence, which we describe as parasitic.

Now if we are to interpret disease from a theological standpoint, it will be necessary to think of the conflicting association of organisms in terms of a wider, perhaps even a metaphysical concept. If disease within general experience is to be regarded basically as that which issues in the struggle between associating organisms, when one manifests disadvantageous functions in the mutual relationship to the degree where another organism thereby sustains impaired activity or exhibits structural or functional degeneration from the operative norm, it may perhaps be possible to restate this antagonism in the more familiar metaphysical concept of the fundamental conflict between evil and good in the cosmos.

The inherent priority of good over evil in the universe is axiomatic in any consideration of their relationship, and this is evident in that evil can be subordinated to its corresponding good in each principal sphere, this being particularly true of the moral and spiritual.¹⁷ That the elements of the world had in fact a basic quality which was the very antithesis of evil is implied in the Creation narratives of Genesis, where the unfolding of the world was appraised by God in terms of the value-concept "good".¹⁸

If good is the recognized norm, the activity of evil represents a distinct departure from that norm, and when in conflict with the good to

impair its efficiency reveals that it has a peculiar parasitic nature,¹⁹ for evil is unable to maintain an existence independently of good, since it can increase and abound only when good is present to sustain its activity.²⁰

In such a sequence there is manifested a similar type of degenerative activity to that which is exhibited in a rudimentary form in the organic parasitism of nature. This is not to say, however, that in the latter there is to be understood a faithful and minutely depicted representation of the larger parasitism exhibited in the conflict of evil with good. But what is implied is that the phenomenon as demonstrable in nature is in fact a portrayal in lowly material terms of an antagonism being carried on at an advanced spiritual level, and apparently involving the whole creation. The very nature of evil itself as parasitic, antagonistic, abnormal and degenerative, is epitomized in the earliest phases of disease. It is at this precise point that the transition is made from the physical to the metaphysical.

It must be obvious that for the effects of evil as exhibited in disease in particular to spring suddenly and unheralded within the human orbit like a malevolent spectre without reference to earlier sequences of evolutionary development through vertebrate and invertebrate species would be as unreal and fanciful as to suppose that the Adamite species took its rise without any relationship to prior forms of neanthropic stock, in the manner of Minerva, who according to classical mythology was produced as the result of a momentary fiat directly from the brain of Jupiter, without recourse to a mother.

For mankind, disease is an aspect of evil which is of the greatest importance, for it is within the scope of human experience that the conflict between good and evil, between nature and nurture, is worked out along lines of profound material and spiritual validity, which transcend by far anything of the meaning which disease had for the earlier phases of associated life.

A Christian approach to the problem of disease will note that not merely is it basically evil, but that, because of its nature it can be dealt with most effectively by relating it directly to the Atonement. To do this it is important to notice that disease is an integral element in the evil situation with which Christ dealt on the Cross. In the so-called Fourth Servant Oracle of the Book of Isaiah²¹ the conquest of physical and mental pathology is part of the atoning work of the Servant. The A.V., R.V., and Revised Standard Version render verse four of chapter fifty-three as follows :

"Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows . . ."
which is a mistranslation of two very common Hebrew words of the original, *הָרַי* and *מַכְיוֹב*, both of which are directly and consistently connected with illness. Thus the original actually reads :

"surely he hath borne our diseases, and carried our pains . . ."
of which some notice is taken in the margins of the R.V. and R.S.V. This is a vastly different conception from the general idea of Christ bearing human distress without reference to pathology.

Disease would thus appear to be regarded as fundamentally spiritual, and amenable to treatment in the same way as other manifestations of spiritual evil, a consonance which, as we have already seen, has been

observed from earliest times. This uncompromising attitude towards disease had been manifested consistently by Christ during His earthly ministry. To that type of mind which adds to the problem of evil by making the afflictions of disease that cross which one is bidden to take up and bear, it must come as a considerable shock to discover that Christ resolutely dismissed disease from any concept of Divine service. For Him it was a manifestation of evil, an epitome of the supreme embodiment of evil,²² and as such to be cast out.

Whilst acknowledging the basically spiritual nature of disease, we shall also go far towards reducing the problem by manifesting an informed prophylactic approach to living which will cater adequately for physical and mental needs. In particular we must be careful to establish the stability of the emotional life, distinguishing between discipline and repression in the process. Culpable negligence in any area of living will be held to be incompatible with the idea of true health of body and soul.

That the stability of the mind and the spirit is a matter of prime importance is significant in view of the fact that the presence in human nature of a disposition towards sin is unfortunately a factor favourable to the advancement of disease, since the warring of the spiritual and material exhibit that state of antagonism²³ which is most advantageous to the spread of morbid conditions demonstrable as having an emotional basis.

An avowed exemplification of the Divine pattern for existence within the experience of the individual will go far towards resolving this conflict. So love will cast out fear, and the consequent spiritual enrichment of the personality will have those significant personal and social repercussions which have always been associated with the Christian faith in action. Thus holiness and wholeness will go hand in hand to refute the absurd pietistic notion that sickness and consequent suffering are connected with spiritual blessings, or that they are the "will of God".

In actual fact it is so frequently the case that when these inner tensions have been resolved, the healing of an accompanying physical disability is an immediate concomitant, showing that the presence of disease is anything but the will of God. Hence, cases of emotional disturbance resulting in duodenal ulcers, rheumatoid arthritis, ulcerative colitis, and a host of other conditions, can be seen with amazing frequency in medical records. The pathology is undeniably real and the pain disturbing, but the entire condition is by no means as intractable as would appear from casual observation. In point of fact, the real level of operation of the diseased condition is the spiritual one, so that being based in the mind rather than in the body, it is immediately amenable to spiritual therapy. Provided that the proper techniques are used, the disease will vanish with an alacrity which to the uninitiated seems nothing less than miraculous.

To discuss the inter-relationship of disease and suffering would take us outside the scope of this article. Whilst suffering is often part of the disease-situation, it must be recognized that it is not a necessary element in disease. Much suffering is of a mental character, and has frequently little or nothing to do with disease. In the light of the

lessons taught by the Book of Job, it would appear that suffering is a necessary pre-requisite to emotional and spiritual maturity, whereas disease and pain are not.²⁴ The New Testament teaches clearly that suffering is the invariable lot of the Christian disciple, and must be accepted as such.²⁵

The Christian Church has traditionally concerned itself with the healing of the sick. Modern thought and modern methods of approach to disease necessitate a re-interpretation of the situation which will satisfy the deepest spiritual needs of the sufferer. The problem of sickness looms before us constantly, and demands attention if we are to be of effective assistance to individuals in times of illness, particularly where the disease is likely to have fatal termination by ordinary standards. To do this it is necessary for Christianity to uphold the total efficacy of that sacrifice made for men by the Great Physician if its message is to be pertinent for the diseased body and the afflicted soul.

REFERENCES

- ¹ J. S. Simmons (ed.). *Public Health in the World To-day* (1949), p. 10.
- ² Cf. "New Problems in the Treatment of Infectious Diseases", C. P. Miller. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, xxxv, 763 (1951); "Sensitivity Reactions to Penicillin Therapy". *Bristol Digest*, Vol. vii, No. 3 (Nov. 1951); "Terramycin—Patterns of Resistance to anti-microbial Agents". *Annals of N.Y. Academy of Sciences*, Vol. liii, 283 (Sept. 1950).
- ³ R. Binder. *Health and Social Progress* (1920), p. 3.
- ⁴ Cf. B. H. Streeter. *Reality* (1926), p. 245 ff.; L. Dewar and C. E. Hudson *A Manual of Pastoral Psychology* (1932), p. 189.
- ⁵ H. Flanders Dunbar. *Mind and Body* (1947), p. 17 passim.
- ⁶ M. A. Ruffer. *Studies in the Paleopathology of Egypt*. (Ed. by R. L. Moodie). (1921).
- ⁷ G. Elliot Smith and F. Wood Jones. *The Archaeological Survey of Nubia* (1910). Vol. ii, p. 274 seq.
- ⁸ *ibid.*, ii, p. 294 seq.
- ⁹ An outline of the epic is given in H. Frankfort (ed.). *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (1948), p. 208 seq.
- ¹⁰ W. H. Rivers. *Medicine, Magic and Religion* (1924), p. 7 seq.
- ¹¹ C. H. Toy. *Introduction to the History of Religions* (1917), p. 225.
- ¹² R. L. Moodie. *Paleopathology* (1923), p. 362.
- ¹³ G. Galloway. *The Philosophy of Religion* (1935), p. 517.
- ¹⁴ R. L. Moodie. *The Antiquity of Disease* (1923), p. 74 ff.
- ¹⁵ H. N. Wieman. *General Zoology* (1925), p. 28.
- ¹⁶ Moodie. *Paleopathology*, p. 342.
- ¹⁷ W. Temple. *Nature, Man and God* (1935), p. 385.
- ¹⁸ Genesis i. 10, et al.
- ¹⁹ vide Streeter. *op. cit.* p. 222; R. Niebuhr. *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (1946). ii, p. 318.
- ²⁰ H. N. Wieman. *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth* (1929), p. 201.
- ²¹ This is generally regarded as comprising lii. 13—liii. 12.
- ²² Cf. Luke xiii. 16.
- ²³ Cf. Romans vii. 18 seq., for a vivid psychological description of this conflict.
- ²⁴ Cf. R. K. Harrison. "The Problem of Suffering and the Book of Job." *Evangel. Quarterly* (1953), Vol. xxv, No. 1, p. 18 seq.
- ²⁵ Cf. Acts ix. 16, Galatians v. 11, Philipians i. 29, 1 Peter ii. 21 seq., et al.

John Evelyn

A Study in Royalist Piety*

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A., D.D., F.R.HIST.S.

I

EVELYN'S DIARY, although not nearly so full or 'gossipy' as that of Pepys, is far more valuable to the historian. Pepys chronicled the events of his life for the ten years 1659-1669, while Evelyn relates the most important and interesting details of a long life lasting from 1620-1706.

Moving as Evelyn did in the highest society of his day on terms of intimacy not only with kings, courtiers and statesmen but with eminent men in religion, science and literature, both of his own and foreign countries, his *Diary* forms a valuable commentary on the contemporary events of the stormy and momentous epoch in which he lived, and is therefore of very great worth to the student of the history, social customs and scientific progress of the times. His ample fortune rendered Evelyn politically independent, and in spite of his personal predilections, he possessed on the whole an impartial and temperate judgment on the current events of his day. Although an ardent and enthusiastic royalist and on terms of intimacy with all the Stuart kings, Evelyn, like Clarendon, was strongly opposed to the arbitrary measures of these Sovereigns. From the Restoration till his death, however, he enjoyed unbroken royal favour. He must evidently have been a man not only of conspicuous ability but also of cultured tastes and engaging manners, since he was a *persona grata* with all the famous and eminent men and women of his time, who delighted to enjoy his society and to accept his hospitality. He travelled very widely on the Continent and spoke French, Italian and Spanish fluently.

The Evelyns were an ancient and honourable family who had for several generations been settled in Surrey, and they were possessed of considerable wealth. John Evelyn's great-grandfather manufactured gunpowder at Long Ditton. John received his early education from the village schoolmaster at Long Ditton and then at a Free School at Southover. Owing to his mother's early death, John was brought up by a too indulgent grandmother, and was certainly not over disciplined. Consequently, at the age of twelve he managed to defeat his father's design to send him to Eton, "the severe discipline" of which he dreaded. Being so much indulged he became a very idle boy to whom study made little appeal, although at sixteen he was entered at the Middle Temple to read Law. But he "spent his time in studying a little, but dancing and fooling more", and at seventeen he went up to Balliol College, Oxford, as a Fellow Commoner, where in May 1637 on his matriculation he duly subscribed the 39 Articles. He studied here for three years. But he confesses in 1637 that till about that year

* An exhibition devoted to John Evelyn opens at the Victoria and Albert Museum in February.

" he had been extremely remiss in his studies ", and that he went to the University " rather out of shame of abiding longer at school than for any fitness ".

His tastes were, however, at this time more in the line of music, sports and pleasure than of books or law, which he cared little about. Soon after the outbreak of the Civil War, finding that he could be of very little service to the King's cause, since his estates, being so near London, were completely in the power of the Parliament, he sought and obtained the royal leave to travel abroad and he made a tour of France, Flanders and Holland. As a young man Evelyn was a prodigious traveller for those days. He not only visited all the notable Paris churches and places of interest but he spent much time similarly engaged in Italy and especially in Rome. He declared that St. Peter's was " the most stupendous and incomparable Basilica far surpassing any now in the world ".

He had a young man's curiosity to see everything, except " the inside of the Inquisition house ", and so he was even willing to kiss the Pope's " embroidered slipper " to obtain a presentation to him. He also visited Naples, Milan, Venice and then Spain. He was assured that " there was little more to be seen in the rest of the civil world after Italy, France, Flanders and the Low Countries, but plain prodigious barbarism ". Evelyn appreciated fully all that was gay and beautiful, and he enjoyed good food and banquets. At Bristol he partook " of a collation of fried eggs and excellent Spanish wine ", and after the consecration of an episcopal friend in Westminster Abbey, he records " the enjoyment of the most magnificent dinner I ever saw in my life ". He played the lute and was very fond of music and of the theatre when not abused " to an atheistical liberty or loose morality ", for he had no use for the " lewd play " which often disgraced the Restoration period.

It was not till after 1652 that Evelyn finally returned from his exile to live in England under the government of Cromwell, whom he called " the arch-rebel and traitor ". He had twice paid short business visits to England, concerning his Estates, one of which involved eighteen months' absence from his young bride, whom he married in 1647. But he settled in 1652 at Sayes Court, Deptford, where he brought his wife, who was the daughter of Sir Richard Browne, the ambassador at the Court of Charles II in Paris, who for nineteen years had maintained the Church of England services in his chapel.

We are inclined to wonder whether the persecution and proscription of " Prelatists " and " Malignants " during the Commonwealth were as severe as has been sometimes represented when we find that Evelyn, a prominent churchman and Cavalier, lived comfortably and on friendly terms with the ministers at the Protector's Court, and was actually able to carry on unmolested a clandestine correspondence with Charles II through the medium of his father-in-law. The Government also apparently connived at his refusal to take the Covenant. In 1660 he was appointed to accompany the deputation from the Parliament to Charles II at Breda, inviting him to return to England, but illness prevented his compliance.

Evelyn was overjoyed at the return of Charles II and indignantly

refuted a "wicked forged Paper" "defaming his Majesty's person and virtues". But not long after he was sadly disillusioned on the latter point since on January 6th, 1662 he condemns the heavy gambling at Court and "retires home for a little", "not at all liking the life of the Court", while he attributed the violent tempests then occurring as a judgment "on this ungrateful and vicious Nation and Court".

After the Restoration Evelyn was much employed in the public or, as we should now term it, the Civil Service. He filled many important offices and sat on several Royal Commissions, although his retiring disposition led him to refuse any signal honours. He was Commissioner for improving the streets and buildings of London in Charles II's reign and later on was appointed Treasurer of the newly founded Greenwich Hospital and was Commissioner of the Privy Seal under James II. He frequently refused the dignity of a knighthood and in 1661 he also declined the honour of a knighthood of the Bath, as well as twice refusing the presidency of the Royal Society of which he had been one of the most active founders. In spite of his numerous public employments, Evelyn in his adult life was a diligent student and a voluminous Author, his best known works being his *Sylva* and his *Diary*. For his influence in securing the famous Arundelian marbles and library for Oxford University he was given the degree of D.C.L. It is also interesting to notice that shortly before his death he was elected a member of the newly formed Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

He suffered great bereavement in his family, several of his children dying when quite young, and only one son reaching manhood, who inherited his father's love of learning, but died before Evelyn himself at the comparatively early age of forty-four. His little boy of five was an amazing prodigy in learning and piety and Evelyn declared on his untimely death at this age, "Here ends the joy of my life". Among the many notable contemporary public events which Evelyn records—the execution of Strafford, the funeral of Cromwell, the Restoration of Charles II—certainly none is more fully or graphically described than the terrible Fire of London in 1666. "All the sky," he declares, "was of a fiery aspect, like the top of a burning oven, and the light seen above forty miles round about for many nights. God grant my eyes never behold the like, who now saw above 10,000 houses all in one flame. . . . The clouds of smoke reached near fifty miles in length. Thus I left it . . . a resemblance of Sodom or the last day. . . . London was, but is no more", while a week later he records, "I went to the ruins, for it was no longer a City".

II

G. W. E. Russell adduces Evelyn's life as a proof of the truth of Shorthouse's statement in *John Inglesant* that "the Cavalier was not invariably a drunken brute",¹ and certainly no better example of a truly pious Cavalier could be given. But while it is impossible to believe that all the piety and godliness of the day were with the Puritan

¹ Prefatory Note, p. 7, to Evelyn's *Diary*.

and all the profanity and vice with the Cavalier, there is little doubt that Evelyn's exemplary career is not fully representative or typical of the men of his party. His frequent laments at the dissoluteness and depravity of the society in which he mixed give us a fairly good indication that his own example was rather the exception than the rule amongst courtiers and Cavaliers of the Restoration period, even though they did not all, as Macaulay insinuates, "utter ribaldry and blasphemy and haunt brothels and gambling houses".¹

Evelyn's mother, a woman of exceptional piety, died when he was fourteen and his father when he was twenty-one, and the loss of both parents at such an early age made a great and apparently permanent spiritual impression on one who, as he describes himself, was at this time of "a raw, vain, uncertain, and very unwary inclination, thinking of nothing but the pursuit of vanity and the confused imaginations of young men". In spite, however, of the many temptations and allurements which must have surrounded a well endowed young man, who moved freely amidst the gay, frivolous, and licentious society of his day, Evelyn preserved the simple, pure faith of a true Christian, and a reputation for virtue and integrity all too rare in that corrupt and degenerate age. As G. W. E. Russell said, "not the best Puritan was more consistently and conscientiously a Christian in faith and speech and act". Not only did he always humbly acknowledge God's special providence in preserving him from attacks by pirates and robbers, but each birthday was set apart as a time of solemn self-examination and of re-dedication to the service of his God and Saviour. Thus on his sixtieth birthday he declares, "I participated of the Blessed Communion, finishing and confirming my resolutions of giving up myself more entirely to God, to whom I had now most solemnly devoted the rest of the poor remainder of life in this world", while seventeen years later he tells a friend that he is "every day trussing up to be gone. I hope to a better place".

In his religious views, Evelyn was a staunch and devoted Churchman. He believed the Church of England to be "of all the Christian professions on the earth, the most primitive, apostolical and excellent". His sympathies were with the new High Church school, inaugurated by Archbishop Laud and the Arminians. But he was not intolerant of other opinions, although he had little love for, or sympathy with the English "sectaries", whom he sometimes describes as the "Canters", and still less for Jesuits whom he considered a most dangerous Order and as the chief authors of the horrible persecutions of the French Protestants. He lived in friendly intimacy with men of all persuasions and when travelling on the Continent he attended Presbyterian worship in Holland and a Huguenot service in Charenton, and also the Reformed Church when at Geneva. He was deeply affected by the barbarous persecution of French Protestants owing to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, attributing it largely to the slackness and duplicity of Charles II in failing to uphold and defend the teaching of the Reformed Church of England for the good not only of England but of all the Reformed Churches in Christendom, "now

¹ *Hist. of Eng.* I, 144. Everyman's Edit.

weakened and near ruined through our remissness and suffering them to be supplanted, persecuted and destroyed, as in France, which we took no notice of". He speaks of "the French persecution raging with the utmost barbarity exceeding even what the very heathen use", and he mentions with shame the small encouragement these 'distressed Christians' received in England and prays that such treatment "may not be laid to our charge". On November 3rd, 1685 Evelyn declared that "France was almost dispeopled and everybody there, save the Jesuits, abhorred what was done".

He was naturally greatly distressed at the broken and shattered condition of the Church during the Commonwealth régime and at the sufferings and privations of her clergy. He frequently entertained at his home the ejected and destitute divines, and in 1650 he was present at a secret ordination service in Sir R. Browne's private chapel in Paris, conducted by the Bishop of Galloway, and on his return to England, when the public use of the Liturgy was proscribed, he had all the offices and services of the Church regularly and faithfully performed in his library at Sayes Court. He relates, however, that as late as 1655 the Government connived at the use of the Liturgy at St. Gregory's church in London, although in December of the same year he chronicles the Protector's harshest and final persecuting edict: "I went to London, where Dr. Wild preached the funeral sermon of Preaching, this being the last day, after which Cromwell's proclamation was to take place, that none of the Church of England should dare either to preach, or administer Sacraments, teach schools, etc., on pain of imprisonment or exile. So this was the mournfullest day that in my life I had seen, for the Church of England herself, since the Reformation, to the great rejoicing of both Papist and Presbyter". This Edict does not, however, appear to have been very stringently enforced, since on several future occasions Evelyn records visits to London to attend Church services and to receive the Sacrament ministered secretly in private houses by famous Anglican divines like Archbishop Ussher and Jeremy Taylor. On March 25th, 1649 he records that "he heard the Common Prayer in St. Peter's at Paul's Wharf and in the morning the Archbishop of Armagh, that pious and learned man (Ussher), in Lincoln's Inn Chapel", and on June 10th he received the sacrament at this chapel and his friend Ussher preached the sermon. He also heard Dr. Jeremy Taylor preach more than once. But in 1659 we find the mournful entry in his Diary that "the Nation was now in extreme confusion and unsettled, between the Army and the Sectaries, the poor Church of England breathing as it were her last, so sad a face of things had overspread us". And shortly after he records that a private fast was kept in London by "the Church of England Protestants" to "beg of God the removal of His judgments, with devout prayers for His mercy to our calamitous Church".

His *Diary* furnishes abundant evidence that the High Churchmen of the renowned Caroline period had none of the medieval and pro-Roman sympathies of many of the modern High Anglicans who repudiate the designation of 'Protestant'. In 1688, when the country was flooded with controversial pamphlets in support of the Romish or

Protestant faiths, Evelyn wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury urging him to see that the title and position of the Church of England were safeguarded from the false claims of the Romanists by the insertion of the words 'Reformed and Protestant' before any treatise in defence of the Church of England as by law established; advice which Sancroft both appreciated and acted upon. Evelyn was seriously alarmed at James II's blatant efforts to pervert the Nation to Romanism and he opposed many of his sinister illegal acts to this end. "All the engines," he records in May 1686 "are now at work to bring in Popery, which God in His mercy prevent". He viewed with disgust the numerous preferments of eminent Romish perverts, "God of His infinite mercy open our eyes and turn our hearts. The Lord Jesus defend His little flock and preserve this threatened Church and Nation" is his prayer. In January 1687 he records that "the English clergy everywhere preached boldly against 'Romish superstition and errors'" and that "'the writing of the Protestants' confirmed the doctrine and discipline of the reformed religion". Of Evelyn's loyalty to Protestantism there was no question. He describes the Pope as 'AntiChrist', and refers to Bishop Cosin's son, after his perversion to Rome, as having "been debauched by the priests". He also defends Cosin from a Puritan libel that he was "one of the most popish of Anglican divines" by declaring that "no man was more averse to Rome" and that "he had saved many from apostacy to it". Romish services and ritual he styles as "the fopperies of the Papists". He refused to license the pervert Dr. Obadiah Walker's books after he had become, as he terms him, 'an apostate'.

Although Evelyn records that, at the funeral of the Bishop of Hereford (Monk) on December 20th, 1661, a silver mitre, probably as an insignia of the bishop's office, was borne, with the episcopal robes, before the hearse, he was certainly no advocate for the ritual use of the mitre for Anglican bishops. For when he describes the opening on 29th December, 1686 of a new Popish chapel at Whitehall, he mentions the Bishop in his mitre and rich copes "with several Jesuits often taking off and putting on the Bishop's mitre" and "the divers cringes" made to the altar, and the crozier put into the Bishop's hand "with a world of mysterious ceremony", and he comments, "I could not have believed I should ever have seen such things in the King of England's palace, after it had pleased God to enlighten this Nation; but our great sin has for the present eclipsed the blessing". In the previous year he had regarded James II as a man "of a most sincere and honest nature"! He was loyally attached to the Stuart dynasty and was much in favour at Court until the King's conspiracy to destroy the Church of England. For Evelyn was, above all things, convinced of "the antiquity and purity of the Church of England doctrine".

It is also interesting to notice, in view of recent controversies, that the Confirmation rubric, although at that time lacking the saving clause 'or be ready and desirous to be confirmed', could have by no means been universally or strictly enforced, since a definite High Churchman like Evelyn did not scruple to receive his first Communion

over two years before he was confirmed. He records that on July 2nd, 1637, "I first received the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the College chapel, and at this time the Church of England was in its greatest splendour". On September 17th and November 5th he again communicated, although it was not till December 16th, 1639 that he speaks of his Confirmation in St. Mary's, Oxford. He also records that as late as 1694 the Holy Communion was only celebrated at his parish church at Wotton four times a year, although apparently in many churches the monthly Communion then prevailed.

From his *Diary* we learn of some of the social and other customs of the day. He first saw coffee drunk in England as a beverage in 1637, but he says it was not a 'custom' till "thirty years later". As late as 1652 women were burned at Smithfield for murder and in May 1654 he "observed how women began to paint themselves, formerly a most ignominious thing used only by prostitutes". In 1650 a journey from Calais to Dover could be made in seven hours 'in a fair wind'. On December 5th 1697 Evelyn tells us that services were for the first time resumed in the new St. Paul's after its destruction by the Great Fire in 1666. In May 1703 he records the death of Samuel Pepys, the Saviour of the Navy, "for near forty years so much my particular friend", and he eulogises him "as a man universally beloved, hospitable, generous and learned in many things".

Although Evelyn had no sympathy with the severe and narrow asceticism of the Puritan domination, his *Diary* abundantly testifies his abhorrence of the license, impiety and immorality so prevalent after the Restoration. The coarse and blatant immorality of the stage received his strongest denunciation, while such brutal and degrading pastimes as cock fighting, dog fighting and bull and bear baiting he turned from with loathing as "butcherly sports and barbarous cruelties".

Living as he did in times of luxury, of war, violence and tumult, and through momentous national upheavals and revolutions, Evelyn succeeded in preserving the calm, even course of the sincere and faithful Christian, conscientiously dedicating his considerable talents and abilities in unostentatious service of his country and his fellow men. Probably Horace Walpole correctly summed up his career when he declared that "his life was a course of inquiry, study, curiosity, instruction and benevolence. The work of the Creator and the minute labour of the creature were all objects of his pursuit". The inscription which Evelyn caused to be put on his tomb at Wotton church gives us the true secret of his character and conduct throughout his long and eventful life. "Living in an age of extraordinary events and revolutions he learnt this truth—that all is vanity which is not honest, and that there is no solid wisdom but in real piety".

Book Reviews

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF CREATION AND REDEMPTION.

By Emil Brunner. pp. 386. Lutterworth Press. 25/-.

This is the second of three projected volumes of Brunner's Dogmatics, and covers the doctrines of creation, man, providence, atonement and incarnation. It will be obvious from this list that the volume before us has much ground in common with the author's earlier books, *The Mediator*, *Man in Revolt*, and *Revelation and Reason*. But even in covering this ground Brunner gives us no mere rehash of stale material and he enlivens his work with numerous comments on current theological trends, especially on the writings of Karl Barth. He also has some brief but useful comments on Bultmann's efforts at demythologising the New Testament. Briefly, his contention is that Bultmann has confused under the heading of myth two radically different and independent matters. There are, on the one hand, such matters of fact as that the earth is not flat (as the Biblical writers thought) but a ball. There is also the quite different "question of the interpretation of History and the Nature and action of God". This "has nothing to do with natural science". It is one thing to "compare the statements of the New Testament with scientific truths which in so far as they are real truths . . . are absolutely final for us". It is quite another thing to "contrast the statements of the New Testament with the thinking of 'modern man'" (p. 265).

But what gives this book its distinctiveness is that the field is seen as a whole and seen from a distinctive standpoint. Brunner sees faith as a personal encounter with the living Christ, and distinguishes it sharply from passive acceptance of "revealed truth". From this viewpoint the dogmatic theologian appears as the servant of the personal encounter of faith. His work must be related to it at every point, though he must never attempt to provide it with its object. It is this standpoint which links together the different doctrines. The doctrine of creation, for example, must not be seen as a speculative idea, but it comes to man as a personal summons. "I am the Lord, thy creator" makes me directly responsible, for it means, "Thou art my property" (pp. 8-9). In the same way what the New Testament says about the Incarnation is not to be regarded as an isolated doctrine but always is immediately related to the "salvation given us in Him. . . . Christological doctrine in the narrower sense, this doctrine of the Person of Jesus is also 'truth as encounter'" (p. 350). It is to this idea of truth as encounter that our author brings us back again and again. Most theologians to-day outside the Roman Catholic Church would agree with him in his assumption that revelation is not primarily propositional but personal. But there are few, if any, who have made so consistent an attempt as Brunner to see what kind of a picture this view of revelation gives of Christian doctrine as a whole.

But his conclusions are not always as acceptable as his standpoint,

nor do they always appear to be dictated by it. In dealing with the Resurrection, for example, he adopts an ambiguous attitude to "the so-called Empty Tomb" (p. 367) refusing to commit himself either way. He regards the matter as unimportant on the ground that it was meeting with the Risen Lord, not the empty tomb, which created the Easter faith; that "the empty tomb is a world-fact which everyone, whether they believe in Christ or not, could have perceived" (p. 368). Further he argues that original testimony to the Risen Lord does not refer to the empty tomb. It may be granted that the empty tomb by itself would not have created the Easter faith. But if the tomb had not been empty, belief in the Resurrection would have been destroyed soon after its birth. Moreover, the earliest testimony implies the empty tomb when St. Paul contrasts what happened on the third day with the statement that Christ was not only dead but also buried (1 Cor. xv. 3-4). Brunner's views on the Virgin Birth, as is well known, are far more emphatically negative.

But these two matters are singled out because they are exceptional rather than typical. The book as a whole is a constructive, clear and vigorous presentation of the central doctrines of the Christian faith. It is of value not only to the theologian but also to the preacher because it relates everything to the personal encounter of faith. Once again we are indebted to Miss Olive Wyon for an eminently readable translation.

W. M. F. SCOTT.

PAUL

By Martin Dibelius. Longmans. 7/6.

This biography of St. Paul was begun by Dr. Dibelius of Heidelberg, but as he died after writing a little over six chapters it has been edited by his former pupil, Dr. Werner Georg Kummel, Professor of New Testament at Marburg, who has amplified the existing notes and brought the number of chapters up to ten.

The work has not the sparkle of T. R. Glover's study of the apostle, or even of A. D. Nock's book ("they cheerfully went after the red herring"—Acts 23. 7), though the picture is concise and clear. The subject-matter is treated from the genetic point of view, and the result is stimulating. The main sources used consist of the Pauline corpus, except the Pastoral Epistles and Ephesians, supplemented by the Acts. As a young man Paul was in Jerusalem for rabbinical higher education, but he was not a fully trained rabbinical scholar, an ordained judge. And he was a bachelor, not a widower. Much in him is to be explained by his conversion: his sternness and gentleness, the heights and depths, exist in him side by side. His emotional language, his excitable thoughts and feelings are due to a highly sensitive nervous constitution. He was sensitive, we should note, not mercurial. "His whole being lacks unity, poise and harmony; and his thought is therefore without system in its form, and without humanism in its content." And yet he shows a passionate single-mindedness. "Paul had to take up a position"—not a "cautiously balanced neutrality". Hence he became first a persecutor and then the man who counted everything loss because of the superlative worth of knowing Christ.

St. Paul's conversion, which rent his life in two, was not so much

from sin to righteousness or from a false God to the true God, as from a religion of righteousness to the religion of the sinner, from a wrong way of honouring God to a right way. It came about, humanly speaking, because he was the first to recognize that the Jewish and Christian conceptions of God were incompatible : if the Christians, despised outcasts as they were, should prove to be right, then God is different from what the Jews believed ; if the Messiah had actually come to the *am haaretz*, as the ecclesiastical highbrows called them, if to Jews on the fringe of or outside of the Law, then why not for the Gentiles also ? The link between the historical Jesus, whom Paul probably never saw, and the apostle, is furnished by the church, " the collection of people . . . (which) was the result of the life's work of Jesus ", a people led to God not by pious deeds but by divine grace.

And so Paul was converted, and we must not make it " evaporate into something pathological ". From this starting point come the basic ideas of Paul's gospel : apart from varied emphases, the letters (which belong to the last fifteen years of his life, anyway, when any essential change in his philosophy would hardly take place) do not reveal any substantial development. But with the conversion came a further shock : " with the best will in the world to serve God, one can pass him by ". Why did God let His people go astray so grievously ? For the answer Paul has to consider sin and salvation—and the righteousness of God, which is at stake. Hence his theology is a theodicy and his theological thought is combined with his missionary action.

Dr. Dibelius then traces the apostle's missionary work, which is first and foremost that of a preacher—a refreshing note this—and his witness and theology. He is not a mystic, for God and man face each other, but he uses the language of the mystic. Union with Christ is achieved not in mysticism or vision but in the dangers of the missionary, which has its challenge and rebuke to our practical age. In a final estimate of St. Paul's work we learn that he was an ambassador to the world, and the unifier of the Church. The first herald of the world wide Church, he kept it one. He put it on a firm intellectual foundation, God's salvation in Christ ; he kept the gospel from perversion by human " works " and human " piety ", and not only in his own day but through the centuries has exercised the critical function of turning men back to the Lord. In the day of the welfare state, and " salvation " when the next government comes in, the modern minister, bullied and cajoled by philosophers and economists, sociologists and the rest, could do worse than refresh his spirit by testing himself by St. Paul. And this book would give him a good start : no-one could say that it is behind the times.

There are some fine sentences worth pondering. " He is a poet, but on his knees ; he lifts his voice, but in God's presence. " " The ' righteous ' man of every kind is hopelessly discredited. " " Paul's view of mankind in the mass (his ' morbid concern over sin ') is not a hopeless one. . . . The world and its peoples do not now lie before Paul as a field of ruins, but rather as a cornfield. . . . " The weighing of evidence is careful and a certain individuality of interpretation is not without its value. Thus Dr. Dibelius holds that Ephesians is an

imitation of Colossians and therefore not a source of information about Paul's thought. This has some support from Goodspeed and Mitton, but Professor C. H. Dodd seems to be still unconvinced. Again, Dibelius holds that "the statements about the actual travelling (in Acts) can be taken as quite reliable"; W. L. Knox regarded them as a mere framework. Dibelius assigns a late date to the Acts; Bruce an early one. For our author, "Paul's speeches in Acts have very little biographical value"; Bruce, with others, would dissent. Dibelius seems to accept the statement that Paul was born at Tarsus; W. L. Knox takes the opposite view. In Tarsus, according to Dibelius, he had learnt a trade, but did not have the social status of a manual worker. Contrast with this the theory of Deissmann. "The stay in Macedonia was of only short duration, but rich in results." Knox is not so optimistic. And so on. Not everyone will agree that Paul "knew nothing" of the necessity of the death of Christ to God, though he used the ideas with which he was familiar, such as expiatory sacrifice. If we of to-day find this language foreign to us, it may be our mistake as it certainly is our loss. The present reviewer will never forget the testimony of two highly intelligent ladies, both of whom he knew, who were present at an animal sacrifice in the East. One of them felt pity for "the poor little goat"; the second immediately remembered that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission". But it may well be the case that the absence of uniformity in New Testament scholarship is a sign of its vitality. And it implies that the preacher of the Word of God is not bound hard and fast to the view of any scholar or group of scholars whose views are "right". For the oracles of God are still the medium through which the living God speaks to and through His contemporary prophets.

Finally, two defects ought to be mentioned. There is a misprint on page 19 in the spelling of "philosophy"; and, much more serious, ought not Christian teachers to avoid even the barest suggestion that the Spirit of God is an "it" (p. 44)?

RONALD A. WARD.

THAT MAN PAUL.

By Edward Carpenter. Longmans. 3/-.

This book is less ambitious than that of Dr. Dibelius: it is shorter and is more of a popular study than an academic treatise. This is, perhaps, its chief value. T. R. Glover used to complain that Sophocles is regarded by some people as "something written in a book", and the same complaint might be made with regard to St. Paul. But here we see him, apostle though he was, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, living in an age not entirely dissimilar to our own. "It is the purpose of this short book to encourage us to catch something from St. Paul and to allow his own triumphant faith to flow into our own lives." Certainly he has his points of contact with us to-day: "the cast of St. Paul's mind was sufficiently practical to make him always suspicious of that which was unintelligible to ordinary people". And yet he did not fail to speak of the deep things of God.

Some striking sentences bring home to us something of the dynamic of the apostle. "He had a disconcerting habit of talking directly about

important things"; "he, equally with us, lived in an explosive world"; "into his letters he empties himself". Speaking of those who have had no "sudden conversion" because they have been brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, Canon Carpenter tells us that "there must have been a time when discipleship of Jesus passed from a climate into a conviction". One is grateful to him for this. But is it right to assert that in preaching the gospel immediately after his conversion "Paul undoubtedly over-reached himself"? Vividness is added to a vivid book by texts from translations by the Bishop of London and by J. B. Phillips. But, if Christ be not risen, are we not *more to be pitied* than all men—not "miserable"?

RONALD A. WARD.

COMMUNION WITH GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By A. R. George. The Fernley-Hartley Lecture, 1953.

Epworth, 1953. 25/-.

This is an able book on an important subject. One of the features of Roman Catholicism that proves most attractive to many people is its highly developed system of piety and its carefully articulated ascetical theology. It is an important element in Roman propaganda to claim that only in the one Catholic Church will true Holiness be found. And, in truth, the "Catholic" ascetical system is very impressive, both in its thoroughness and in the heights of asceticism that it can evoke. Many converts have been won as a result of the impression made by the deep devotion of the "religious". Protestants are by no means convinced that this claim to unrivalled sanctity should be taken at its face value. To take one simple, but very relevant, matter: it is not evident that the predominantly "Catholic" areas of the world have produced a higher level of morality than the Protestant ones. It is clear, however, that these claims pose profound questions with regard to the nature of true holiness. What place is there for mystical experience, asceticism, the "religious life"? Is the great system of "Catholic" piety a proper development of primitive Christianity, or is it a perversion of it? Do its affinities with non-Christian mysticism show that a great measure of divine light has been bestowed upon the pagan world apart from a knowledge of the gospel? Or, do they show that paganism has invaded the Church? The only answer to these searching questions is to be found in a thorough study of the nature of true piety as revealed in our dominical and apostolic source-book. *Communion with God in the New Testament* is just such a study.

The author, who is Tutor in Systematic and Pastoral Theology and Philosophy of Religion at Wesley College, Headingley, seems to stand very much in the Vincent Taylor tradition. He has a good command both of the apparatus of New Testament scholarship and also a good knowledge of the broader theological field, with the result that his work is relevant as well as scholarly. In his introductory chapter he seeks to define mysticism and to classify the different approaches that have been made to it. He identifies three broad types of piety. Firstly, that which speaks of absorption in, or union with, the Transcendent Being, who is often not personally conceived. Secondly, that which

speaks of mutual indwelling. Thirdly, that which speaks of man's separation from God, and thinks rather of eschatological salvation than present communion. He then proceeds to examine in detail the relevant New Testament teaching. He gives particularly careful attention to the Synoptic Gospels, with valuable studies on Jesus as a Man of Prayer and on the Teaching of Jesus on Prayer. Then he surveys in turn the teaching of Acts, St. Paul, the Johannine Writings and the Rest of the New Testament, before coming to his concluding chapter.

Not surprisingly, he finds that the New Testament consistently conforms to his second type of piety. He realizes, of course, that his classification is a great over-simplification, and his study in fact brings out the richness and variety of New Testament language. In the course of the discussion, K. E. Kirk's *The Vision of God* comes in for severe criticism, and he argues that Kirk's stress on the "vision of God" as the predominant New Testament conception does not represent the true emphasis. He believes that "knowledge of God" or, even better, "communion with God" more truly represents the basic New Testament concept.

The meat of the book is to be found in the middle chapters, which is straight New Testament work, and it is here that the writer is at his best. But I have to confess that my interest was aroused by the opening chapter, which raises broader theological questions, and I was consequently disappointed that my appetite once whetted was by no means satisfied. I gained an impression that the author, though widely read, had an eclectic rather than a systematic theology. He has abundant references to modern writers—Methodist, Lutheran, Anglo-Catholic, Roman Catholic, Liberal, Dialectical and non-descript—but, perhaps significantly, I did not notice any reference to a classical Calvinist writer. No reference, for instance, to B. B. Warfield's two large volumes on "Perfectionism". Systematic theology has its dangers, but it is essential to coherence, and the Calvinist school has produced the systematic theologians *par excellence* of Protestantism. Had he been more deeply steeped in Reformed theology, I believe that the conclusions would have been more satisfying, and that even the fine New Testament work (e.g., in the treatment of the Atonement and in some points of criticism) would have benefited.

J. W. WENHAM.

A THEOLOGY OF SALVATION : A COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH 40-55.

By Ulrich E. Simon. pp. 266. S.P.C.K. 25/-

The title of this commentary is a sign of the changing emphasis in Old Testament studies, so long dominated by the literary-historical approach. Mr. Simon is well versed in such technicalities, and holds radical views on the dating of these chapters, but his main concern here is to expound the prophecy theologically. His method is to let the text govern the scheme of his book, so that the subjects it raises are discussed as they come into view, and the reader is given no choice (except by resort to the index) but to make the journey on foot, so to speak, with the prophet; exploring rather than viewing from afar the contours of this country, and joining in the long climb to the summit. A great many matters come up for discussion on the way, sometimes

interrupting the progress excessively, so that the sense of direction is obscured ; but in general the scheme is justified, keeping the commentary in step with the Word while setting it out as a continuous exposition. The exception to this method is in the Hebrew notes, which are collected at the end of the book.

Mr. Simon holds, with C. C. Torrey, that the author of these chapters was a prophet ministering to a dispirited and dispersing Judaism at the close of the fifth century—that is, a hundred years and more after the rebuilding of the temple. This “extreme” view has the curious effect of bringing Mr. Simon closer, in some important respects, to those who believe in the unity of the book of Isaiah than to the upholders of the “moderate” critical view. He is clear of the maze of false trails that lead from the idea of the prophet as an exilic patriot in whom the career of Cyrus aroused extravagant hopes of the immediate future. Instead he sees him as a preacher (“perhaps the creator of what is technically known as a sermon”) who “points intentionally to the suffering Messiah and his atoning work as the crisis of God’s work among men”. Similarly, the “Comfort ye” which sets the tone of the prophecies does not, to our author, spring from the conviction that the Exile has by now inflicted more than enough punishment, but from the revelation that “only transcendent intervention from the sinless can dispose of sin”. The term “Servant of YHWH”, while it “covers a wide field and gathers up new meanings” in the course of the prophecy, is “the new formal title of the Messiah”. It is the Messiah accordingly who is portrayed in chapter liii (and here the commentary leads us step by step through the chapter in such a way as to make us encounter it as if for the first time). In the view of the commentary, the late dating of the work makes it “at least possible that the prophet witnessed the ritual of the Day of Atonement in Jerusalem”, and the author notes both the similarity of the teaching of this chapter to that of Lev. xvi (concerning not only expiation but the transference of guilt from the guilty party to the innocent) and also the new departure that it makes in setting forth atonement as “not a seasonal rite but an everlasting act of God”, with a unique victim who is both “priest-shepherd” and “victim-sheep”. “Substitution must be used in reconciliation, yet not animals must replace men but the Messiah must consciously embrace and put upon himself the sins of the people.” After resurrection “the Eved-Messiah crowns his kingship with intercessory priesthood”. Again, the call to depart from Babylon is interpreted not politically but typologically, symbolizing the second Exodus which is spiritual and messianic.

These chapters, then, are given their full theological and indeed Christological weight. At the same time the author, in cutting loose from the exilic theory, robs the allusions to Cyrus and the historical liberation from Babylon of a great part of their force. He would clearly be much happier if Cyrus could disappear from the text altogether (especially as he rejects the statement in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22—and its sequel in Ezra—that “the LORD stirred up the spirit of Cyrus” to liberate the Jews), and he toys with Torrey’s expedients for excising the name, unconvincing though he finds them, before reluctantly resorting to typology for his explanation. If, however, we are willing

to attribute the prophecies to the authentic Isaiah, we at once recognize a well-established principle of prophecy whereby God reveals the distant future in terms of the nearer, and so provides not only a "type" but a specific message for the generation that embodies it. It is doubly purposeful typology. So, for example, our Lord chose to predict the last days in terms of the forthcoming siege of Jerusalem, to the special benefit of many who were called upon to live through that event.

There are, naturally, many points at which those who hold an orthodox view of inspiration will differ from Mr. Simon, and there are some examples of strained interpretation (e.g., on "with the rich in his death", p. 217, and on chabburah-chabburah, 236).

But this is a book which grapples with some of the central doctrines of the faith, and with the thought of perhaps the greatest of the prophets, with honesty, acuteness and depth.

There are misprints apparently on p. 70, line 16 ab im ; p. 74, lines 10 ab im. and 13 ; p. 104, line 2 ; p. 229, lines 11 and 15.

F. D. KIDNER.

THE PARTY SYSTEM IN GREAT BRITAIN.

By Ivor Bulmer-Thomas. Phoenix House. pp. 328. 25/-.

Mr. Bulmer-Thomas has most usefully filled a surprising gap in the literature of British political democracy. We have a good deal of material on Parliament, on Cabinet government and on local political institutions, but no recent study of the party system. Such a study is essential if we are to understand ourselves. The law and the constitution, it is true, take no more account of parties than they do of the office of Prime Minister, yet the heart of British politics is found in the party system. The author is peculiarly well qualified to write this study as he has been a Labour M.P. and is now a Conservative one ; and on the whole the book is free from the *tenden* that such a personal political history might lead one to expect.

It is not a work of research, but it assembles a great deal of information over a wide field, and not otherwise easily accessible. It does this in a most readable fashion, so that the background knowledge which an intelligent citizen ought to possess becomes a pleasure to acquire. The book begins with some simple general history from the seventeenth century to 1951 as the basis for a discussion of the present two-party system. Various schemes for electoral reform are persuasively rejected. The third section on party organization is the heart of the book, and there follows a brief but useful treatment of such related matters as the Press, parties and Religion, and parties in local Government. Weaknesses are admitted—the selection of candidates comes in for most criticism—but in general the working of the party system is ably defended as making for a healthy democracy. Many of the sections could well be expanded into books, and it is clear how much research there is waiting to be done in this field by students of political theory and government.

Minor points of criticism come to mind. The Conservative Party has always refused to give details of how it is financed, and Mr. Bulmer-

Thomas has not been able, or has not wished, to get behind this studied vagueness. He also much underestimates the Tory character of the bulk of the provincial press. But points such as these are trifles compared with the general merits of the book.

The author is a prominent Anglican and that is one reason why readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* should be interested in it. A much more important reason, however, is that Christians are so muddled about politics, and often so misinformed, that they are ineffective where they ought to be usefully discharging the duties of citizenship. Some are uncritically Right; others unrealistically Left; many are cynical about party politics and have no understanding of the necessary role of power in public life and how it should be controlled; many are just uninterested, and therefore irresponsibly support the *status quo*. Yet God has placed us in a political order in which He requires our responsible participation as a necessary part of our service to our neighbour. That participation in Britain requires us to come to grips with the party system and to understand the basic theory of our political life. This book provides our only guide to the former and a persuasive discussion of the latter. It is important for both clergy and laity, and if the cost is too much for clerical purses let it at least be got from libraries.

The following misprints have been noted: p. 83, for Zetland read Shetland; p. 188, for than read that; p. 231, 1797 is erroneous; p. 249, for inextricably read inextricably; p. 274, for Queensborough read Queenborough; p. 294, for ar read or.

RONALD H. PRESTON.

GENESIS I-XI.

Alan Richardson. S.G.M. 7/6.

This further addition to the Torch Bible Commentaries is fully up to the high standard which we now expect from volumes in this series. Both the matter and the general lay-out are excellent.

The book contains thirty pages of introduction and ninety-four pages of commentary, which appears to be the right proportion in a book of this kind. In the introductory section Dr. Richardson first deals with the place of Genesis in the Jewish canon of Scripture, and then proceeds to discuss the Pentateuch in the light of modern research. He expounds briefly and clearly the critical orthodoxy of J, E, D, and P, and then presents this theory of the sources dressed in the latest fashion. "One thing at least seems fairly generally agreed: it is impossible to date these sources as belonging to or confined within any particular period. Each of them represents a current of tradition or way of thinking which persists through Israel's history. . . ." The character of J and P, the sources with which we are concerned in this part of Genesis, is then considered. The section on "The Parables of Genesis" is of particular interest. These 'parables' are the two creation stories, the Fall, Cain and Abel, the Flood and the Tower of Babel. In this connection the use of the word "myth" is considered and rejected because of the fact that "mythical" conveys to most minds the impression that we are dealing with fiction, not fact. "A

parable is a story which may or may not be literally true (no one asks whether the Good Samaritan ever literally 'happened'); it conveys a meaning beyond itself." After thus defining what he means by "parable", the author adds, "It is of the utmost importance to realize that the parables of Genesis are to be read in the way that we read poetry, not prose". The general attitude of the author will be sufficiently indicated by the addition of one further quotation: "The parables of Creation do not offer us a theory, a philosophical hypothesis, of how the world came into existence; nor does the parable of the Fall offer us a scientific analysis of human nature. On the contrary, they offer me personal knowledge about my existence, my dependence upon God, my alienation from Him, my need of reconciliation to Him". Thus, I must understand that the truth expressed applies to me; that, for instance, I am Adam. Thus a conflict between "science" and "Genesis" is impossible. In passing, it may be asked whether all this is quite satisfactory. It does not matter for the Gospel story whether or not the Good Samaritan "happened"; surely it does matter for the whole subsequent story of the Bible whether or not the Creation or the Fall 'happened'.

In the Commentary each section is dealt with, first, in a general way, and then comment is made on the actual text. We are given here just the right amount of information and guidance, and no difficulties are avoided. The really valuable thing about the whole volume is the grand theological emphasis throughout. The Creation narratives are dealt with in turn. In the case of the J account the author points out the anthropomorphisms. He is convinced that the writer did not take his own figures literally. God planting the garden, Adam's rib, the Lord God walking in the cool of the day, and similar features, are all the language of the parable. "Such childishness would be incompatible with the simple, majestic and indeed transcendent conception implicit in the phrase, 'Jahweh God made earth and heaven', and with the whole conception of God in J". Particularly in the comment on Genesis cc. 2 and 3 are many things that are most suggestive and thought-provoking, and most excellently put. We may not reject the story of "The Fallen Angels" in Gen. vi. 1-4 as a piece of pagan mythology. It contains an essentially biblical insight. We are to understand that "the men of the Bible took the facts of sin and evil seriously; the Fall was not merely a human catastrophe but was cosmic in its scope, affecting the whole creation". Even the genealogies are found to have "a profound theological significance which is germane to the theme of the Bible as a whole".

That the early chapters of Genesis are figurative and symbolical, though conveying great facts and truths, is no new doctrine. It was held, for instance, by Bishop Handley Moule thirty-five years ago. Yet there will be many who are not prepared to go as far as Dr. Richardson in this direction. However, there is very much here of profound spiritual insight, which should be a delight to all students of the Bible. It would be a great mistake to miss this book because one's presuppositions are different from those of the author.

W. G. BROWN.

FOOLISHNESS TO THE GREEKS.

By T. R. Milford. S.C.M. Press, 1953. 6/-.

This is one of the freshest little books I have read for a long time. It consists of eight chapters, the first six of which constituted addresses given in the course of a mission to the University of Toronto in 1952. Chapter 7 is "an attempt to explain, mainly in terms of prayer, the meaning of being 'in Christ' here and now". Chapter 8 is intended to give an intellectual justification for the method of speaking in the rest—it is more 'philosophical' in its approach than the preceding chapters.

The Chancellor of Lincoln has a way of understanding the contemporary mind and catching the contemporary phrase, which makes this book suitable to put into the hands of a modern sceptic or agnostic. It is shot through with humour and often reaches a high level of religious insight. One quotation—on thanksgiving—must suffice :

"Thanks be to God who has matched us with His hour.' Thanks for 'each sting that bids nor sit nor stand but go'. Thanks for the knocking down of screens; thanks for the blowing away of dust. Thanks for forgiveness, given and received. Thanks for youth, while we have it, and for middle age, which is so much more interesting, when it comes: and, if we live to see our children's children, and peace upon Israel, thanks for the faithful Israelite's blessing. But the best is yet to be. Give thanks for death, and death shall be the last best offering of life's long Eucharist."

A book to read, and to lend.

F. D. COGGAN.

AMY CARMICHAEL OF DOHNAVUR.

By Frank Houghton. S.P.C.K. pp. 390. 12/6.

The reading of this book was a moving spiritual experience, for it is a book which glorifies the goodness and the power of God to the full. An outstanding Christian biography is a rare thing these days, and the reason for this must not be attributed to any supposed dearth of able biographers, but to the lamentable fact that Christians who fit into the truly apostolic category have become very difficult to discover. Amy Carmichael was a woman of genuine apostolic calibre who set out, in all simplicity, to prove the faithfulness of God and to put into practice day by day our Lord's commandment of love. The sub-title to this book—"The Story of a Lover and Her Beloved"—is entirely appropriate. It was unquenchable Christlike love that caused her, in the face of odds that were, humanly speaking, insuperable, to devote her life to the rescue of Indian temple children who, many of them while still infants, are set aside for a life of immorality and debasement. It was the same principle of love—"pure, shining love", as Bishop Houghton describes it—which created and has all along sustained the Dohnavur Fellowship, enabling the members of the community to triumph over sorrow and disappointment and every assault of the evil one, and permitting them to witness the development, from the humblest beginnings, of a work which now stands as a magnificent monument to the sovereign love and grace of Almighty God. Here, surely, is proof irrefutable that the same power of the Holy Ghost

which the Apostles of old enjoyed is still available to God's servants in the twentieth century if they will but trust Him and keep His commandments.

It is true, as Bishop Houghton points out, that a little one has here become a thousand (*cf.* Isa. lx. 22), for it all started in 1901 when a little Indian girl fled from the temple precincts to "Amma" for protection, and when "Amma" died fifty years later practically a thousand souls were being housed, cared for, and instructed in the Dohnavur compound. The practical woman and the mystic were strangely but finely blended in Amy Carmichael's character, but above and behind all else she was a saint of simple childlike faith whose fellowship with her Heavenly Father was so intimate that she expected Him to make His will known to her from day to day, and then to enable her to put that will into effect. She never asked for money nor even made known the particular needs of the work to others : it was more than sufficient for her that God knew the need and had promised to supply it all according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus.

Bishop Houghton will not desire praise for the manner in which he has executed his task as biographer, for he has performed it as a service to the Lord. Suffice it to say that, as those who know him will have expected, the book is written with calm graciousness and spiritual discernment. Amy Carmichael's own books and verses have been a source of blessing to many over the past half century. Now that she has been promoted to the heavenly glory she will continue to speak and live and love through the pages of this biography, and God will continue to enrich many through this testimony to the power of His beauty and grace in a life which was to such a degree "conformed to the image of His Son".

PHILIP E. HUGHES.

THE WRITINGS OF ST. LUKE.

By Roland Koh. Diocesan Literature Committee, 1 Lower Albert Road, Hongkong. 3/6.

This book provides an attractive and significant sample of the reaction of an able, industrious and well-read Eastern mind to modern scientific criticism of the Gospels. First, as a Christian the writer confesses that he has had his mind disturbed, when he found the historicity of parts of the New Testament questioned by eminent scholars. He has in consequence set himself to discover alternative and more conservative hypotheses ; and confesses that the interpretations as outlined in his book have helped to restore peace to his mind.

His main contentions are that the "former treatise", to which Luke refers in Acts i. 1, is Proto-Luke, written A.D. 58-60 ; that Paul encouraged Luke to put together such a written record of our Lord's life and teaching for use in Gentile evangelism ; that the source L, which Luke used, was originally connected with Decapolis not Caesarea ; that Acts was prepared as an apologia for Christianity to help in Paul's defence at his trial in Rome, and was therefore completed by A.D. 63 ; and that the full Third Gospel was not put together until after A.D. 70.

One reader at least is left feeling that there is here an illustration of the potential danger inherent in being forced to fight an enemy with

his own weapons—in this case subjective hypotheses, which are no sure safeguard of the coveted peace of mind. Would that the works of Western Biblical scholars helped to inform and instruct the faith, rather than to arouse the doubts and misgivings of Eastern converts to Christianity.

A. M. STIBBS.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

By John Drewett. Highway Press. 6/-.

This short book is a refreshing, readable analysis of Nationalism and Communism (the two modern cultures which 'both serve the function of religion to their adherents') in the light of Christianity as it has been and as, in the author's belief, it shall be. For Mr. Drewett believes that we are on the verge of a world revolution; he believes that the signs of the times point to the coming birth of a world community of which Christianity shall be the midwife—if, that is, Christians 'equip themselves for the task'.

Sixty-seven pages might seem too short for the theme. But in spite of inevitable generalizations Mr. Drewett succeeds in offering a stimulating study of Christianity's part in the world scene, and a book for the times which may be read with ease by layman or parson. Yet, not every reader will agree with the author's conclusions. 'Christian International' may be going into action, as he says; and he gives a vivid summary of the work being done, and to be done, in the home, in education, and in politics. But the crux of the matter, the individual, does not receive sufficient attention, and the result is a suggestion that the Church's rightful purpose is to bring in the kingdom by social and political action.

J. C. POLLOCK.

MATTERS OF LIFE AND DEATH : AN ENQUIRY INTO SPIRITUALISM, FAITH HEALING, AND PSYCHIC RESEARCH TO-DAY.

By Geoffrey Murray. Sidgwick & Jackson. 10/6.

This is one of the rare books on the subject of psychical research that is written without an axe to grind. Mr. Geoffrey Murray, as a journalist, conducted an enquiry into the subjects specified in the sub-title, trying to be as impartial as possible. As a result he has produced an informed picture of most aspects of this strange world, whose laws have not yet been classified. Obviously one who approaches the book from the standpoint of the Biblical revelation will not agree with all the conclusions, but all the comments are fair.

In view of the posters in the London streets advertising a certain spiritualist paper with the words, "Life after death proved", it is interesting to read Mr. Murray's comment on page 78; "What is the nature of the Spirit World? What is the truth about life in heaven and in hell? Because of the divergence of Spiritualist teaching, the answers given by the different sects are sometimes at variance, just as their theology does not always agree".

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

NOTES ON BOOKS RECEIVED

The Anglican Pulpit To-day. Edited by F. D. Gifford (*Mowbray*, 15/-). These 'representative sermons by leading Preachers of the Anglican Communion', edited by the Dean of the Philadelphia Divinity School, include sermons by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, and Anglican dignitaries and clergy in all parts of the world. Forty-two such sermons can scarcely be truly representative of Anglican preaching, and twenty-nine are from the United States or Canada. Only five are from Great Britain. The Provost of Nairobi and Dr. Barton Babbage, lately Dean of Sydney, are among the very few evangelicals. Yet with all its obvious limitations it is good to read and study, for good preaching, whatever its subject, must beget good preaching.

Bless this Roof. By Julia Burton and Phyllis Garlick (*Highway Press*, 3/6). A story of a Nigerian girl, born of a Christian mother in a pagan home, and growing up to become a Christian nurse, and then to found a home of her own. It gives an insight into the difficulties and joys of being a Christian in a country still predominantly pagan, and is a fine testimony to work being done by women missionaries and by African pastors and their wives.

The Confessions of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. A new translation by J. M. Cohen (*Penguin Classics*, 5/-). This complete edition will prove most useful to the student, and makes more accessible for the general reader the thought and experiences of Rousseau. It is also, naturally enough, full of human interest and entertainment. Unfortunately, to pack it into six hundred and six pages in paper covers has led inevitably to a print which is rather too small for comfort.

The Pope's Men. By Nathaniel Micklem (*Independent Press*, 1/-). This brief story of the Roman Church, written at the request of the Life and Work Committee of the Congregational Union, is so sane and balanced, giving a clear and reasoned exposition of the dangers of Romanism, that it may be thoroughly recommended.

Helping the Lay Preacher. By John Wilding (*Independent Press*, 6/-). A book packed with hints on sermon-making and sermon-delivery, and the conduct of informal services. Specially to be recommended for students, and speakers at Crusader Classes. Experienced preachers will also read it with profit.

The Word of the Lord Came. . . . By Eric Fenn (*S.C.M.*, 3/6). Mr. Fenn prepared these 'imaginary introductions' to twenty of the books of the Bible for the children's magazine of the Bible Society. The three major prophets and five of the minor are included, and nine epistles, two gospels, Acts and Revelation. A real help for Sunday school teachers and the like.

The Rosenberg Letters. Foreword by Canon L. John Collins (*Dennis Dobson*, 7/6). This collection of intimate letters of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, in the three years between arrest and execution, is certainly moving. The letters are presented without editorial comment. They cannot, therefore, in themselves, do more than raise an emotional sympathy unrelated to the facts of the case. But as human documents they are well worth reading.

There's an Answer Somewhere. By Marcus Knight and L. S. Hawkes (*Longmans*, 7/6). This book, which has a foreword by the Bishop of Portsmouth, was commissioned by the Church of England Youth Council as a result of numerous requests by youth leaders for guidance in answering questions on the Faith. Canon Knight of St. Paul's and the Rector of Blechingley have taken several hundred questions which actually had been asked, have sorted them into subjects, and then written a general answer for each section. This method avoids the shallow 'snappy answer', while keeping to the fore the original purpose of the book. Part I answers questions on 'What is the Christian Religion?' and Part II, 'What is Man?' The authors have throughout sought to avoid subscription to sectional beliefs, and though this means that no one will agree with all their interpretations, the book certainly represents a useful basis of discussion. Study of the question lists alone would help prepare youth leaders and clergy for the questions they may expect, and the answers given are stimulating.